



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines


Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:


- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



















We certify that the Report of the  
Discussion which took place in the Roman  
Catholic College of Downside, near Bath,  
on the 25<sup>th</sup>, 26<sup>th</sup>, & 27<sup>th</sup> of February, and  
the 5<sup>th</sup> 6<sup>th</sup> & 7<sup>th</sup> of March 1834, as  
published by J. G. & F. Rivington, St. Paul's  
Church Yard, & Booker, Bond Street, is  
alone authentic, each proof sheet having  
received our Signatures..

J. J. Brown  
Edward Tottenham

---

February 5<sup>th</sup>, 1836.

---

J. F. Johnson } Short-hand writer on the  
Protestant side.

R. Merrett<sup>Jr</sup> } Short-hand writer on the  
Roman Catholic side.

THE  
**AUTHENTICATED REPORT**  
OF THE  
**Discussion**

WHICH TOOK PLACE IN THE CHAPEL OF THE  
**ROMAN CATHOLIC COLLEGE OF DOWNSIDE,**  
NEAR BATH,

*On the 25th, 26th, and 27th of February, and the 5th, 6th,  
and 7th of March, 1834.*

Subjects:

“ THE RULE OF FAITH,”

AND

“ THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.”

PROTESTANT SPEAKERS:

REV. EDWARD TOTTENHAM, A.M., Missionary of the British Reformation  
Society, (now Minister of Kensington Chapel, Bath.)  
REV. JOHN LYONS, A.M., Minister of All Saints Church, Liverpool.

ROMAN CATHOLIC SPEAKERS:

REV. T. J. BROWN, Professor of Theology in Downside College.  
REV. T. M. MACDONNELL, Roman Catholic Missionary at St. Peter's Chapel,  
Birmingham.  
REV. FRANCIS EDGEWORTH, Roman Catholic Missionary at Bristol.


LONDON:

J. G. AND F. RIVINGTON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD,  
AND WATERLOO ACE,

AND

J. BOOKER, NEW BOND STREET.

1836.





THE

## DISCUSSION AT DOWNSIDE.

---

FIRST DAY.—*Wednesday, Feb. 26, 1834.*

---

SUBJECT :

### THE RULE OF FAITH.

EDWIN T. CAULFEILD, Esq. of Bath, on taking the Chair, said, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have but few or rather no preliminary observations to make, in consequence of a paper which has been put into my hands. Usually the office which I am called upon to undertake, devolves on those whose services and ability do honour to the office ; on the present occasion I feel it is an office that confers honour on the individual who holds it. If I obtain your approbation, support, and indulgence, I have no doubt I shall be enabled to perform the office to your satisfaction and my own. I will now read the paper written by Mr. Brown and agreed to by Mr. Tottenham : it is to this effect.

“ At the Old Down Inn, on the 10th of January, 1834, a meeting of the Reformation Society was held, at which the Roman Catholic doctrine of Purgatory was, by public announcement, to be compared with Scripture, intimation having been given, that any Roman Catholic Priest, pledging himself to abide by the rules which would be read to the Meeting, should be heard in defence.

“ Towards the close of the Meeting, a friend of the Rev. Mr. Brown, of Downside College, declared that Mr. Brown was willing to discuss, upon certain conditions, any of the points of controversy between Roman Catholics and Protestants, stating, however, that he had not been authorised to make this declaration by Mr. Brown, but that he could answer for his approbation.



“ In consequence, two interviews took place between the principals, in the presence of their friends, at the latter of which Mr. Brown declared his readiness to accept the general invitation.

“ Accordingly a PUBLIC DISCUSSION was agreed to upon the following conditions:—

“ 1st. That the audience shall be admitted by tickets, to be disposed of equally by each party.

“ 2nd. That no public indication of approbation or disapprobation be given by any one present.

“ 3rd. That the discussion commence each day at 11 A. M. and that no speaker address the Meeting for more than *three quarters of an hour* at one time.

“ N. B. To this rule it was afterwards added, by mutual agreement, that the *opening* speaker on *each* subject might be allowed to take a full *hour* if he pleased.

“ 4th. That the Meeting close on each day, after both sides shall have had an opportunity of addressing the Meeting *three* times.

“ 5th. That one subject only be discussed on each side.

“ 6th. That the subjects of discussion be, the “ RULE of FAITH,” and the “ SACRIFICE of the MASS:”—The Rule of Faith to be discussed first, and the discussion to be opened by the REV. MR. TOTTENHAM—the discussion on the Sacrifice of the Mass to be opened by the REV. MR. BROWN.”

“ *Jan. 14, 1834.*”

It is now my duty to call on the Rev. E. Tottenham.

THE REV. E. TOTTENHAM.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,—There is a saying of the Apostle Peter, which I desire to place in the forefront of the proceedings of this discussion; and it is this:—“ Be ready to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and with fear.” 1 Peter iii. 15. And whilst I hold, Sir, controversy to be, at certain times and seasons, a Christian duty, I trust I may ever maintain that that duty ought to be conducted “ in meekness and in fear;” and I pray God that the proceedings, which may take place within these walls for several days, may be carried on in the spirit of kindness and of mutual charity.

For myself, Sir, I hope I may say that I do not enter upon this discussion trusting in my own sufficiency, but in the strength of that God who has promised to be with his

people in the hour of trial ; and it is to me a matter of no small consolation to reflect, that “ the race is not always to the swift, nor the battle to the strong ;” and that God sometimes chooses “ the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty.”

I have only one word more of a preliminary nature to offer, and that concerns our friends who have assembled to hear this discussion. My dear friends, let me entreat of you, in affection and in earnestness, that you would, on this important occasion, divest yourselves, as much as possible, of every thing that savours of prejudice ; and that, believing we are going to discuss subjects of vital and eternal consequence, you would come to the consideration of them in that state of mind which their supreme importance demands.

The subject, Sir, which we are met to discuss on this, and the two following days, is one which lies at the foundation of the whole controversy ; and it is one, therefore, on which we ought to possess true and accurate ideas. It is the “ **RULE OF FAITH**,” or, in other words, the standard by which we are to regulate our belief.

Now, before proceeding to the investigation of the subject itself, I shall, for our better understanding of the terms of it, take advantage of the clearness and perspicuity which I think has been displayed by Archbishop Tillotson in his definitions on this subject.

“ A rule,” says he, “ (when we speak of a rule of faith) is a metaphorical word, which, in its first and proper sense, being applied to material and sensible things, is the measure according to which we judge of the straightness and crookedness of things ; and from hence it is transferred by analogy to things moral or intellectual. A moral rule is the measure according to which we judge whether a thing be good or evil ; and this kind of rule is that which is commonly called a law, and the agreement or disagreement of our actions to this rule is, suitably to the metaphor, called rectitude or obliquity. An intellectual rule is the measure according to which we judge whether a thing be true or false ; and this is either general or more particular. Common notions, and the acknowledged principles of reason, are that general rule, according to which we judge whether a thing be true or false. The particular principles of every science are the more particular rules according to which we judge whether things in that science be true or false. So that the general notion of a rule is, that it is *a measure, by the agreement or disagreement to which we judge of all things of that kind to which it belongs.*”

And arguing upon this principle, in reference to the faith of a Christian, the Archbishop says in conclusion :—

“ A rule of faith is the measure, according to which we judge what matters we are to assent to, as revealed to us by God, and what not. And more particularly, the rule of Christian faith is the measure, according to which we are to judge what we ought to assent to, as the doctrine revealed by Christ to the world, and what not.”—*Tillotson's Rule of Faith*, Part I. Sect. 1.

Having thus given a definition of a rule generally, and of a rule of faith in particular, we come to ask the question (and, O my friends, it is an important question), **WHAT IS THE RULE?** On this subject, as on many others, there is a vast difference of opinion between Protestants and Roman Catholics. The Roman Catholic has a compound rule, namely, scripture and tradition, or what he calls the written and unwritten word, proposed and explained by the church. This is the definition which has been given by Dr. Milner and others; so that you will perceive that the Roman Catholic holds a two-fold rule, **SCRIPTURE and TRADITION**—and a Judge or Interpreter to explain it. The arguments upon this subject I shall have occasion to refer to in the course of the discussion. Protestants, on the other hand, hold the **BIBLE ALONE**—the written word alone (to the exclusion of those books which are commonly called Apocryphal) to be the rule of faith.

Now, Sir, let me here correct a mistake into which most Roman Catholic controversialists have fallen relative to the Protestant rule of faith. They conceive it to be *the Bible alone, interpreted by each man's private judgment*. At the outset of this discussion, and in order to remove difficulty, I beg leave at once to protest against such a definition of our rule; or if our friends on the other side *will* so explain our rule, then let them remember this, that I distinctly call for *documentary evidence* to shew their explanation to be correct. I maintain that the Protestant rule is not the Bible alone, *interpreted by each man's private judgment*, but it is simply the **BIBLE ALONE**: and private judgment is only that which is exercised on the rule, and is no more the rule itself, than the telescope through which we look at the heavenly bodies is to be confounded with the heavenly bodies themselves. To prove that I am correct in this definition of the Protestant rule of faith, I shall refer to the standard documents of some of the Protestant Churches. The first I refer to is the 6th Article of the **CHURCH of ENGLAND** :—

“ Holy Scripture *containeth all things necessary to salvation* : so that whatsoever is not read *therein*, nor may be proved *thereby*, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.”

Then it gives a list of the books, *excluding the Apocrypha*. So far for the judgment of the Church of England

upon the subject. Now I hold in my hand the Confession of Faith of the CHURCH of SCOTLAND, and in it we read thus :—

“ Although the light of nature, and the works of creation and providence, do so far manifest the goodness, wisdom, and power of God, as to leave men inexcusable ; yet are they not sufficient to give that knowledge of God and of his will which is necessary unto salvation. Therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry times, and in divers manners, to reveal himself, and to declare that his will unto his Church ; and afterwards for the better preserving and propagating the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the Church against the corruption of the flesh, and the malice of Satan and the world, to commit the same *wholly unto writing*, which maketh the Holy Scripture to be most necessary, those former ways of God's revealing his will unto his people being now ceased. II. Under the name of Holy Scripture, or the word of God written, are now contained all the books of the Old and New Testaments, which are these (giving the same list as the Church of England), all which are given by inspiration of God, *to be the rule of faith and life*. III. The books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of Divine inspiration, *are no part of the Canon of the Scriptures*, and therefore are of no authority in the Church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved, or made use of, than other human writings.”—*Westminster Confession of Faith*, chap. i. sect. 1, 2, 3.

The Larger and Shorter Catechisms, which I have here, and which are in use in the Church of Scotland, distinctly define the rule of faith in the same manner as does the Confession of Faith, and the 6th Article of the Church of England. I have also the “ HARMONY OF THE CONFES- SIONS” of the Protestant Churches of Saxony, Wirtemberg, Bohemia, and others, giving the same definition.

Thus I have stated what our rule is—I have given documentary evidence—and be it remembered that it is THE BIBLE ALONE, not with the gratuitous addition “ *interpreted by each man's private judgment*.”

Now I shall proceed to establish, so far as I can in the time allotted to me, the authority and sufficiency of this rule. I do not feel myself called upon at this moment to enter into the proofs which we may adduce for the genuineness, authenticity, and inspiration of the Scriptures, because I presume I am arguing with those who believe in all those things. It may happen, in the course of the discussion, that we shall be compelled to refer to the subject, and then I may be enabled to shew that we can receive the Bible as a divine revelation, independently of the infallible decisions, as they are called, of the Romish Church, or of any other Church. For the present, I shall content myself with this simple remark—The Bible could not have been the production of *bad* men, because such men would have made a book more in unison with their own depraved tastes and inclinations ; and it could not have been the production of *good* men, because







*as having come from God*, we shall at once yield submission to its declarations, and acknowledge it equally binding as the written word; but, *until that be done*, we have no right, after having seen the sufficiency of the written word, to receive any other rule of faith. Although, therefore, I am not in strictness bound to attempt any proof upon this subject, yet I shall advance some considerations from Scripture, which naturally lead to the conclusion I have mentioned.

FIRST, let me observe, that THE WRITTEN LAW *was the ONLY one which the JEWISH CHURCH* had. It is true some maintained traditions, which, be it remembered, were *condemned by our Lord*; but the only rule the Church really had was the written word. I shall give a few passages on this subject; and the first to which I shall refer, is in the sixth chapter of Deuteronomy, sixth and following verses:—

“And *these words*, which I command thee this day, shall be in thy heart; and thou shalt *tell them to thy children*, and thou shalt *meditate* upon them sitting in thy house, and walking on thy journey, sleeping and rising. And thou shalt bind them as a sign on thine hand, and they shall be and shall move between thine eyes. And thou shalt *write them* in the entry, and on the doors of thy house.”

I beg particular attention to what is here stated. 1st, The written word of God was to be the rule of *the people themselves* to whom this was addressed. 2ndly, It was to be the rule by which they were to guide *their children*, for they were to teach these words which were written in the law “unto their children.” 3rdly, It was not merely the moral law, the Decalogue, that was to be regarded by them, but the whole written law of God, because the chapter begins with the declaration “These are the *precepts*, and *ceremonies*, and *judgments*, which the Lord your God commanded that I should teach you, and that you should do them in the land, into which you pass over to possess it; that thou mayest fear the Lord thy God, and keep *all his commandments and precepts*.” ver. 1, 2. And likewise, be it remembered, 4thly, that the law was not to be transmitted orally, but *it was to be written*: “Thou shalt *write them* in the entry, and on the doors of thy house.” (ver. 9.)

The next passage is found in the 11th of Deuteronomy, 16th and following verses:—

“Beware lest perhaps your heart be deceived, and you depart from the Lord, and *serve strange Gods*, and adore them: and the Lord being angry shut up heaven, that the rain come not down, nor the earth yield her fruit, and you *perish quickly* from the excellent land, which the Lord will give you. *Lay up*

*these my words in your hearts and minds*, and hang them for a sign on your hands, and place them between your eyes. *Teach your children that they meditate on them*, when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest on the way, and when thou liest down and risest up. Thou shalt *write them* upon the posts and doors of thy house : *that thy days may be multiplied*, and the days of thy children, in the land which the Lord swore to thy fathers, that he would give them as long as the heaven hangeth over the earth. For if you keep the commandments which I command you, and do them, to love the Lord your God, and walk in all his ways, cleaving unto him, the Lord *will destroy all those nations* before your face, and you shall possess them, which are greater and stronger than you."

Now mark, 1st, a most important thing in the commencement of this passage. Here the Israelites were warned against falling into idolatry ; and what was that which was to *preserve* them from it? Why it was *the written word* of God, because immediately after the warning contained in the 16th and 17th verses, it follows, "Lay up *these my words* in your hearts and minds . . . . teach your children that they meditate on them, &c."—Then, 2ndly, there is here repeated, what was said in a former place, that they should *teach them to their children*, and *write them* on the doors of their houses. And mark, 3rdly, the blessed consequences and promises connected with adhering, not to the oral, but to the written word :—"That *thy days may be multiplied*, and the days of thy children, &c.—For, if you keep the commandments which I command you, and do them, to love the Lord your God, and walk in all his ways, cleaving unto him, *the Lord will destroy all those nations* before your face," &c. ver. 21—23. Now there is no other rule recognized here but the written law, and that law is said to be able to effect that to which I have referred, and the adherence to it is accompanied with the blessed promises I have mentioned.

Again in Deuteronomy xxxi. 11—13, we read thus :—

"When *all Israel* come together, to appear in the sight of the Lord thy God, in the place which the Lord shall choose, thou shalt read *the words of this law* before all Israel, in their hearing ; and *the people being all assembled together*, both men and women, children and strangers, that are within thy gates : that hearing *they may learn*, and *fear the Lord* your God, and keep, and fulfil all the words of this law : that their *children* also, who *now are ignorant*, may hear, and fear the Lord their God, all the days that they live in the land whither you are going over the Jordan to possess it."

Here, Sir, 1st, there is a reference again to the *written law*. And was it to be a rule only for a certain body among the Israelites, and not for the whole of the people? Were the whole people to take the dictates of the priests of old, or were they referred to some infallible tribunal beside the written word?—not at all—for, 2ndly, we read in the 11th and 12th verses that this law was to be read "*before all*

*Israel, men, women, children, and the strangers that were within their gates.*" And not only this; but mark, 3rdly, *the result* which was to ensue, as in the former case; "that hearing *they may learn and fear* the Lord—that their children who *are now ignorant*, may hear and fear," &c. Why, Sir, we hear a vast deal about the obscurity of the word of God, but in this passage we find that the reading of the law, the written law, which was thus commanded, was the very thing to *preserve them from ignorance*, and to lead them into the fear of the Lord.

I shall now call your attention to the book of Joshua, chap. i. verse 8:—

"Let not *the book of this law* depart from thy mouth; but thou shalt *meditate* on it day and night, that thou mayest observe and do all things that are *written* in it; THEN shalt thou *direct thy way, and understand it.*"

First of all, here is a *negative* exhortation, if I may so speak, to Joshua—he was not to neglect the written law. There is, 2ndly, a *positive* exhortation—he was not only not to neglect, but he was to *meditate* on it. I cannot imagine how he could meditate on the law without exercising that judgment which God had given him. Then, 3rdly, it was *the written law*, because it is said, that he might "do all things *that are written therein*"—not all those things conveyed by oral tradition, but all those things "*written therein.*" And, 4thly, what was to be the *result* in Joshua's case? I suppose he was not to understand the law?—the law would be too obscure for him? but what says the Lord? "THEN shalt thou *direct thy way, and understand it.*"

Now we shall turn to the second book of Chronicles, or, as it is called in the Roman Catholic Bible, (from which, I beg to say, I have quoted all these passages) the second book of Paralipomenon, chap. xvii. verse 7—9:—

"In the third year of his reign (that is, of Jehoshaphat's) he sent of his *princes*, Benbail, and Abdias, and Zacharias, and Nathanael, and Micheas, to teach in the cities of Juda; and with them the Levites, Semeias, and Nathanas, and Zabadias, and Asael, and Semiramoth, and Jonathan, and Adonias, and Tobias, and Thobadonias, Levites, and with them Elisama and Joram, priests. And they taught the people in Juda, *having with them the book of the law of the Lord.*"

Here is a fact recorded in the history of Jehoshaphat, and mark you, 1st, that when these individuals were sent about to teach the people, the rule that they carried with them was *the written law*—it was not a supposed infallible authority with which they as a body of men were invested, but it was the written law, for the text says, "they had

with them *the book of the law* of the Lord." And it is a very remarkable thing also to notice, 2ndly, that laymen, as well as priests, were included in the commission, because we find in the 7th verse that he sent several *princes*, as well as Levites and priests, to teach the people out of the law of the Lord.

In the 34th chapter of the same book, ver. 29—33, we read thus :—

"And he (that is, Josiah the King) called together all the ancients of Juda and Jerusalem, and went up to the house of the Lord, and *all the men of Judah*, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Priests and the Levites, and *all the people from the least to the greatest*. And the King read in their hearing in the house of the Lord *all the words of the book*. And standing up in his tribunal, he made a covenant before the Lord to walk after him, and keep his commandments, and testimonies, and justifications, with all his heart, and with all his soul, and to do the things *that were written in that book which he had read*. And he adjured *all* that were found in Jerusalem and Benjamin *to do the same*: and the inhabitants of Jerusalem did according to the covenant of the Lord the God of their fathers. And Josias took away *all the abominations* out of all the countries of the children of Israel: and made all that were left in Israel, to serve the Lord their God. *As long as he lived they departed not from the Lord the God of their fathers.*"

Upon this circumstance, recorded in the history of Josiah, let me make one or two remarks. First of all, be it observed of this passage, as of others to which I have referred, that the law was to be *for all the people*, for the words are, "*all the men of Judah*, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Priests and the Levites, and *all the people from the least to the greatest*." ver. 30. It was thus to be for all the people, no matter how ignorant they were in this world's knowledge; and I cannot understand, if the people of old were to have the written law, which was not half so plain as the New Testament, why the people of the present day should be afraid to follow the direction of the written word of God. 2ndly, It was not the Priests merely who were to read the law to the people, but laymen too, even the King. 3rdly, Observe it is not oral tradition of which the passage speaks, but the *written* law: for what did Josiah say to the people? He exhorted them "to do the things that were *written in that book* which he had read." Josiah was a good King, and the only law to which he referred was that "*written in the book*;" and he not only read it for himself, and kept those sayings, but he "adjured all those in Jerusalem and Benjamin *to do the same*:" he told all the people to attend to the written law, and therefore he recognised it as the supreme rule that they were to follow. 4thly, What was *the result* of all this? We often hear that men, acting according to this obscure and unin-



telligible book (as it is called), namely, the Bible, get into strange notions, and a variety of other things are said respecting it, upon which I shall not dwell; but this was not the case with Josiah, for we find he had a clear knowledge of the things that were written. And what was the effect? First of all, *he expelled idolatry*—"he took away all the abominations out of the countries of the children of Israel;" and, secondly, they were *preserved* during his whole life *by an adherence to the written law*; for, "as long as he lived," says the last verse, "they departed not from the law of the God of their fathers."

I have only one more passage to which I shall refer, at present, out of the Old Testament; it is contained in Isaiah xxxiv. 16:—it is a short passage, but it says much.

"Search ye diligently in the book of the Lord, and read."

To what were the Israelites here directed, in order to find out any truth of God? They were directed, I suppose, to a living, speaking, infallible tribunal? I do not read anything about that. They were directed to follow oral tradition? Not a word about that—but they were directed *to follow the written law*:—"Search ye diligently in the *book of the Lord, and read.*" It was not merely to be casually read, without the exercise of the judgment upon it, but they were to "*search it diligently*;" and, I am sure, they found the more diligently they searched, the more were they preserved from error. But so far, I think, this is distinctly established, that the *written law was the only one which the Jewish Church had*:—if they had another law, let us be told where it was, and let our opponents produce the evidence upon it.

Now, I proceed to another observation, which establishes, in my mind, that the written word is to be regarded as the *only* Rule of Faith. OUR LORD AND HIS APOSTLES *invariably referred to the written word as the standard of appeal*. I shall read some passages from the New Testament on this subject; and the first to which I shall refer, is the account of the temptation of our Lord in the wilderness, as related in Matthew, chap. iv.

"Then Jesus was led by the Spirit into the desert, to be tempted by the devil. And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, afterwards he was hungry. And the tempter coming, said to him, If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread." v. 1, 2, 3.

Here was the first temptation by Satan; and how did our Lord overcome him? Simply *by the testimony of the written word of God*—he referred to nothing else—

“ Jesus answered and said, **IT IS WRITTEN**, Not in bread alone doth man live, but in every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God.”—(v. 4.) The devil still thought he had some hope, and we find he came with a second temptation :—

“ Then the devil took him up into the holy city, and set him upon a pinnacle of the temple, and said to him, If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down, for it is written, that he hath given his angels charge over thee, and in their hands shall they bear thee up, lest, perhaps, thou dash thy foot against a stone.”—v. 5, 6.

Now, if there were another law, to which our Lord might have referred, doubtless, when it appears that Satan did not give way after the first temptation, we might expect that our Lord would have referred to it; but this was not the case; he referred to the very same law as before—“ Jesus said to him, **IT IS WRITTEN**, again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.”—v. 7. The devil made a third attempt :—

“ Again the devil took him up into a very high mountain; and shewed him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them. And said unto him, all these will I give thee, if, falling down, thou wilt adore me.”—v. 8, 9.

What was Christ's answer? Then Jesus saith to him, “ Begone, Satan, for **IT IS WRITTEN**, The Lord thy God shalt thou adore, and him only shalt thou serve.”—v. 10. Here are three attempts of Satan to seduce our Lord; and in each of the three cases, he was overcome by the simple testimony of the written word of God; and the consequence was, that “ the devil left him, and angels came and ministered unto him.”—v. 11.

The 21st chapter of Matthew, contains the next passage to which I shall refer, the 15th and 16th verses :—

“ And the chief Priests and Scribes seeing the wonderful things that he did, and the children crying in the temple, and saying, Hosanna to the Son of David, were moved with indignation, and said unto him, Hearest thou what these say? And Jesus said unto them, Yea, *have you never read*, out of the mouths of infants and of sucklings thou hast perfected praise?”

Here was a recognition of *the written law*, as the only one to which the people had access, and by which they were guided; and our Lord appeals to it in attestation of the circumstances that had taken place. He did not say, have you never heard, by tradition, conveyed from generation to generation? Have you never heard from a supreme infallible tribunal, the Jewish Priesthood? but, have you never *read*?—it is the written word he produces as a testimony.

A similar case occurs in the 42d verse of the same chapter,

where, after the perusal of a parable, which was especially directed against the Jewish Priests, and the Pharisees, we read as follows:—

“ Jesus saith unto them : *Have you never read in the Scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner ?*”

There was a subject which vitally concerned the essentials of religion. It was about Christ himself—the chief corner-stone of his Church—the very and eternal God—and whence did our Lord derive proof of what he said on this subject? Not from tradition—not from an infallible tribunal among the Jews—if such there was—but *from the written word*—“ *Have you never read, &c. ?*”

The next passage is in the 22d chapter of Matthew ; and this is a very remarkable chapter. I shall read the entire passage, beginning at the 23rd verse.—

“ That day—there came to him the Sadducees, who say there is no resurrection, and asked him, saying, Master, Moses said, If a man die, having no son, his brother shall marry his wife, and raise up issue to his brother. Now, there were with us seven brethren ; and the first, having married a wife, died ; and not having issue, left his wife to his brother. In like manner, the second, and the third, and so on to the seventh. And last of all, the woman died also. At the resurrection, therefore, whose wife of the seven shall she be ?—for they all had her. And Jesus, answering, said unto them, *You err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they shall neither marry nor be married, but shall be as the angels of God in Heaven. And concerning the resurrection of the dead, have you not read that which was spoken by God, saying unto you, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob ? He is not the God of the dead, but of the living. And the multitudes hearing it, were in admiration at his doctrine. But the Pharisees, hearing that he had silenced the Sadducees, came together, &c.*”

Now, attend to this very remarkable circumstance,—1st. The Sadducees had fallen into error—they denied the resurrection. I know that some people tell us, that the reason of that error, was, because they rejected tradition, and I read this statement in a publication very lately. I think, however, our Lord was of a different opinion, because he said, “ you err,” not because you neglect tradition, but “ *not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.*” Then mark, 2ndly, how our Lord proves the doctrine that was denied. He proves it simply by a reference to the *Scriptures* :—“ And concerning the resurrection of the dead”—the very doctrine about which they were in error—“ *have you not read that which was spoken by God, saying to you,*” and then he refers to a passage in the 3rd chapter of Exodus, and thus proves the resurrection of the dead *from the written word*, and not from any other authority. 3rdly, What was the effect of all this? The Bible is, we are told, a dumb judge—its testimony will never lead a man

to believe,—but he must have more positive and striking authority. It had a different effect in the case of the Sadducees, for we find it stated in the 34th verse,—“ But the Pharisees hearing *that he had silenced the Sadducees*, came together.” He put them to silence—by what?—THE WRITTEN WORD.

I shall now call your attention to the 10th of Luke, 25th and 26th verses :—

“ And, behold, a certain lawyer stood up, tempting him, and saying, Master, what must I do to possess eternal life? But he said to him, *What is written in the law? how readest thou?*”

Observe the question the lawyer put; it was the most important question that a man could put—it was about his best and his eternal interests—it was about the way to obtain eternal life—and no question is of such momentous interest as that to every one of us. How did our Lord answer it? By a reference to tradition? By a reference to the authority of the Church? Not at all. But “ *what is written in the law? how readest thou?*” and therefore our Lord declared the fact, that, if he had *read in the written law*, he might have found an answer to the question which he had put.

I shall next refer to the 16th chapter of Luke, and shall begin at the 27th verse. Previous to this verse our Lord gives us the history of the rich man and Lazarus, and we find from it the awful consequence of neglecting the Lord and his truth in our life-time; for we are told the rich man “ lifted up his eyes, being in torments.” When he found it was impossible that he himself could be benefited, now that he was in the state of everlasting misery, he is represented as addressing Abraham on behalf of his family, reasoning, doubtless, within himself, that if he could not succeed in his own case, he might be able to do something to save them. Then he says—

“ Father, I beseech thee that thou wouldest send him (i. e. Lazarus) to my father's house, for I have five brethren, that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment.”

What does Abraham answer? Then Abraham said, “ They have *Moses and the prophets* (i. e. the written word), LET THEM HEAR THEM.”—(v. 29.) The rich man, like many at the present day, was not satisfied with this, and therefore he said (v. 30), “ No, father Abraham, but if one went to them *from the dead* they will do penance,” or “ they will repent,” as we (in the authorised version) have it. But what was Abraham's second reply? Abraham

said to him, “ IF THEY HEAR NOT MOSES and THE PROPHETS, neither will they believe *if one rise again from the dead.*” Now here is a testimony given us that if the evidence of the Scriptures fails, a man would not be persuaded though one rose from the dead. If that be the case, I cannot see how the Scriptures are not a *sufficient* rule of faith, and the *only* one to which we must refer in such matters.

The next passage is in the 24th chapter of Luke, verses 25—27. This chapter contains an account of the interview which our Lord had with two of his disciples after his resurrection, as they were going to Emmaus. He entered into conversation with them, and we find he said in the 25th verse—

“ O foolish and slow of heart to believe in all things which the prophets have spoken. Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and so to enter into his glory ? And *beginning at Moses and all the prophets*, he expounded to them *in all the Scriptures* the things that were concerning him.”

The disciples were in error respecting the character of Christ, and what was the cause of the error?—why, *it was ignorance of the Scriptures*. Our Lord says to them, “ Ought not Christ to have suffered these things ?” and he reproves them, by referring to the written word, and “ *beginning at Moses and all the prophets*, he expounded to them *IN ALL THE SCRIPTURES*”—not from the testimony of oral tradition, nor from the authority of the Church—but “ *IN ALL THE SCRIPTURES* the things that were concerning him.”

Then in the 44th verse of the same chapter Jesus said—

“ These are the words which I spoke to you while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are *written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms*, concerning me. Then he opened their understanding, that they might understand *the Scriptures.*”

Here again we behold the only standard to which Christ referred—the three great divisions of the Jewish Scriptures, the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms. There was no other authority brought forward by Him, but simply the written word.

I pass from Luke to the Acts of the Apostles, and I find in the opening of the 17th chapter, verses 1—3, as follows :—

“ And when they had passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia they came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews. And Paul, according to his custom, went in unto them ; and for three Sabbath days he reasoned with them *out of the Scriptures* ; declaring and insinuating that the Christ was to suffer, and to rise again from the dead ; and that this is Jesus Christ whom I preach to you.”

Now here St. Paul went to dispute with the Jews, and *what was the rule* by which he guided his disputation? I suppose he told them that they should attend to the decisions of the Jewish Sanhedrim? I suppose he told them to attend to the tradition that had been handed down from father to son through the lapse of ages? No. He reasoned with them "*out of THE SCRIPTURES*"—out of the things that were *written*—that was the rule by which he disputed.

Again, in the 11th and 12th verses of the same chapter, speaking of the Bereans, the sacred historian says:—

"These were *more noble* than those in Thessalonica, who received the word with all eagerness, *daily searching the Scriptures*, whether these things were so. *And many indeed of them believed.*"

Now mark, 1st, what the Bereans did; *they took the Scriptures as their rule*; they "*searched the Scriptures daily*," to see whether the things that they heard were true or not. And, 2ndly, were they wrong in doing this? Ought they rather to have gone to some church, which should have propounded to them, by virtue of an infallible authority, what they ought to believe? Ought they to have attended to the declarations of oral tradition? No; they were perfectly right in looking *to the Scriptures* as their rule of faith, for the Evangelist speaking under inspiration says, "*They were more noble* than those in Thessalonica," because they thus searched the Scriptures. 3rdly, What was *the result*? Mark particularly this. The Scriptures, we are told, are not sufficient as a rule of faith—they do not contain all necessary truth to be believed. Now here we find the Bereans received the Scriptures as their rule of faith, and what is said of them? "*Many of them indeed believed.*" This was just the result of adhering to the written word as a rule of faith.

The 18th chapter of Acts, and the 28th verse, is the next to which I shall refer, where the writer, speaking of Apollos, says—

"With much vigour he convinced the Jews openly, shewing *by the Scriptures* that Jesus is the Christ."

First of all, mark here how Apollos proved his proposition, that "*Jesus was the Christ.*" It was not by tradition, though many among the Jews contended for its authority; but it was *by the Scriptures*—"Shewing *by the Scriptures* that Jesus is the Christ." 2ndly. Did this appeal fail? I suppose, if the Scriptures were not sufficient as a rule of faith, it would have failed; but we find it

did not, for we read that “with much vigour he *convinced* the Jews, shewing,” &c. There again we see the only standard to which reference was made.

I shall now solicit your attention to the 24th chapter of Acts, and 14th verse. In this place Paul is making his defence before the Roman Governor, and in his speech he says,—

“But this I confess to thee, that according to the sect which they call heresy, so I serve the Father and my God, *believing all things which are written in the law and the prophets.*”

Now what did Paul believe?—just all the things *that “were written in the law and the prophets:”* there was the only rule by which he regulated his faith, not admitting any other authority but the authority of *the written word.*

In the 26th chapter, and the 22nd verse, as we found the Apostle Paul before, in the last-mentioned chapter, making his defence in the presence of Felix, and bearing his testimony to the perfection of the written word and its sufficiency; so we now find him bearing his testimony before Agrippa, and in this address or speech of his he says,

“Being aided by the help of God I stand unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, *saying no other things than those which the Prophets and Moses did say should come to pass.*”

In this passage the Apostle distinctly tells the assembly, that he said neither to small nor great any other things but those things “which the prophets and Moses,” that is, which the written word, “did say should come to pass.” This is another example to shew what was the Apostle’s rule of faith, and what it was from which he derived the doctrines that he taught.

The next passage to which I shall advert is in the 15th chap. of Romans, and 4th verse. As I find my time is just expiring, this is the last verse to which I shall refer. The Apostle Paul wrote to the ancient church at Rome, and he speaks thus:—

“What things so ever were written, *were written for our learning: that through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, we might have hope.*”

Here, be it observed, first of all, that the written word is the preventative of ignorance, because the things written before “were written *for our learning,*” says the Apostle. And then what is to be the result of looking to the written word as our standard and rule? “That, through patience and the comfort of the Scriptures, *we might have hope.*”



Now hope, to be true and genuine, presupposes the existence of *faith*. If, therefore, "through patience and comfort of the Scriptures," we may have *hope*, it follows that "through patience and comfort of the Scriptures" we may have *faith*; and therefore the Scriptures are sufficient as a rule of faith.

At present I shall go no further. I have stated distinctly, in the hearing of our friends present, what the Protestant rule of faith is; and I have guarded it against the interpretation which is generally attached to it by Roman Catholic controversialists. I would repeat, it is THE WRITTEN WORD ALONE, without the gratuitous addition, "*interpreted by each man's private judgment.*" In proof of this I have referred to texts which establish that the written word contains all things necessary to be believed for salvation. And then I have proved, by several passages, that the only law which the Jewish church had, and which our Lord and his apostles on every occasion recognized, was the written law, and that they referred to no other authority in furtherance and defence of the pretensions they put forth. So that the legitimate conclusion is, that we Protestants are right in receiving the Scriptures as a *sufficient* rule of faith, and the *only* rule, till it be distinctly proved on the other side that there is an additional rule, and till that rule be authenticated as having come from God.

---

THE REV. T. J. BROWN.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,—Before entering upon the subject with which I have charged myself, I feel it a duty to myself, as well as to my friends, some of whom are inclined to disapprove of my conduct in meeting in this public manner the gentlemen of the Reformation Society, I feel it due to myself and to them to state the motives which have induced me to engage in this public discussion, and which made me choose this place as the arena of controversy.

During the twenty years we have resided in this neighbourhood, we have endeavoured to cultivate a good understanding with our Protestant friends; we have endeavoured not to make religion a pretence for violating the duties which we owe to society—the duties of charity which we



owe to each other; and we have the grateful reflection that we have received from our Protestant neighbours many instances of their good will towards us. Such, however, has not been the case with regard to all our neighbours; there have been some few, (they are known to many of you, though perhaps not known to all) who have for some years past endeavoured to molest us by many wanton provocations. They have not confined themselves to the verbal dissemination of their abuse against us, but have moreover circulated it in calumnious tracts, which they have brought to our very homes. These have found their way into the hands of our neighbours, dependants and tenants, and have contained charges, not against our speculative doctrines merely, but against the principles of our moral conduct; they have contained charges for which, if true, we ought to be expelled from society. Forbearance seemed only to increase the violence with which we were assailed! and it was at length deemed necessary, in self-defence, that some one, (I charged myself with the task,) should request those persons, who thus violated the laws of justice and charity towards us, to come forward and substantiate those charges; or make some satisfaction for the past, and give us reason to hope that we should not be so assailed for the future.

This was refused; and one consequence of this refusal has been before you. There have been published the letters which passed between me and the parties to which I have alluded; and you may therein see that we could not obtain that satisfaction which, I believe, every reflecting man will think due to us. In consequence thereof, I deemed it necessary to reply in a number of tracts, six of which I published, to the accusations and calumnies brought against us, in a certain pamphlet called *Popery Unmasked*. To my work an abortive attempt at reply was made; no other has found its way to the public.

In December last I received an invitation from the organ of the parties which assailed us, inviting me to contend with the gentlemen of the Reformation Society, at a public meeting to be held in Bath. I declined it, because I felt that I should not be justified in introducing the excitement, prevailing here, into a different neighbourhood. Since that, I have been told that the person in question was not authorised by the Reformation Society to make such a proposal.

However, on the 10th of January this year, by public

notice, a meeting was called by the British Reformation Society in our immediate neighbourhood ; and although the delegates of that Society have since declared that they did not call the meeting for the purpose of connecting themselves with the controversy that had been going on, it was notwithstanding understood by the neighbourhood generally, so at least we heard from various quarters, that they came forward for the purpose of identifying themselves with the aggressions which had been made upon us. The terms of that meeting were such as I found I could not, in justice to the cause of which I appear the humble advocate, accept. A friend of mine, however, was present, and hearing my name frequently mentioned by the Chairman, and used by others during the meeting, he stated at the conclusion, (unauthorised by me certainly, for I did not know that he had it in contemplation to say any thing regarding me,) that I was ready and willing to meet on fair terms the members of the Reformation Society. I say that I knew nothing of his making such a proposal : but whether I should have approved, or whether I now do approve of it, is not to the question. Many reasons there are why *I might* have instructed him to do so ; for I am convinced if we did not meet the gentlemen of the Reformation Society—and had the meeting which took place at Old Down been suffered to close without such a signification of our willingness to meet them, I am convinced that a shout of triumph would have been raised by the opposite party. Even though I declined meeting the Reformation Society at Bath, under circumstances that clearly justified me, an insinuation was made to me in a letter which I received, that through fear I did not appear there upon the platform. I am convinced, moreover, that the aggressions against us would have been carried on with tenfold violence ; and therefore I rejoice that this meeting now takes place, not that I like such public meetings, but because I feel it necessary to defend my religion and the religion of my Catholic friends. Accordingly, at a private interview with the members of the Reformation Society at the house of a common friend, it was agreed that there should be a public discussion, and this is the consequence of that agreement.

Now, with regard to the place, it was certainly thought desirable by both parties, that the meetings should be held in one of the Dissenting chapels in this neighbourhood, as being capacious, and affording great accom-

modation, and we had reason to hope that this wish would have been gratified. It turned out, however, that the trustees of the various chapels were reluctant to allow them for such a purpose, and we had but the choice of two other places; one was the ball-room at Old Down, which was certainly smaller, and less commodious than this chapel; the other was the Baptist Chapel at Paulton, offered by the Rev. T. Clarke: but the distance from us being five miles, would make a journey of ten miles a day necessary, and the uncertain state of the weather made it appear far more desirable that the meeting should be held here. I hope, therefore, that those friends of mine, who have been disposed to disapprove of my conduct, will now see that I was justified in the steps I have taken.

With regard to public controversies, it is proper for me to state, what my friends know, that I have a personal dislike to them. It very rarely happens that they are productive of much good. There is generally an excitement so great, that it obscures the understanding, and throws obstacles in the way of truth; moreover, many who attend such public meetings, come not for the purpose of seeking after truth, but in order to witness the triumph which their respective champions are expected to gain. Accordingly, my own feelings are averse to public meetings. The Reformation Society, however, seems to have courted them, and it has threatened us with meetings year after year in this neighbourhood. I hope I shall be able to convince the respectable assembly before me, that the Reformation Society is not justified in holding us up to the taunts with which they have assailed us, and to general obloquy. I know not, indeed, what could induce them to select this particular spot wherein to hold their annual meetings. It has happened that Catholic Doctrines have not made any great progress in this neighbourhood; but if any good shall result from such meetings, that, certainly, in my estimation, will be to the advantage of the Catholic Religion. The spirit of inquiry which may be excited will lead, I trust, to a change of sentiment amongst those who are now prejudiced against it. I never heard, indeed, that a public discussion brought about the apostacy of any one from the Catholic religion; but this I know from my own personal acquaintance, and I have heard the like from many friends, that the contrary has been frequently the result of public discussions. With regard to the party feeling which may exist, I

trust that the regulations now adjusted will prevent any of its evil consequences which have attended similar controversies. I trust that while we discuss the motives of our belief and of our hope, we shall not violate charity, which is the greatest of the three virtues; that we shall not violate that virtue, which shall endure, when faith and hope are exchanged for the sight and possession of God.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I must own, that I do to a certain degree feel hampered by the restrictions under which I am placed with regard to the Rule of Faith; whereby I am excluded from impugning the right of private judgment, and am to consider the Bible as the only rule of Protestant belief. I am willing to allow that, *abstractedly considered*, the Bible alone is the rule of faith to the Protestant; but it is extremely difficult to discuss this subject, if I am not allowed to notice the medium by which the rule of faith is applied, namely, the private judgment of every individual. Such a prohibition as is now fixed on me, has not been fixed on others on similar occasions. At the public discussion in Cheltenham, the rule of faith was the subject proposed to be debated; and it was considered by the Chairman, without any remonstrance on the part of the Reformation Society, to include not the Bible alone, but also private judgment, by which the Bible is interpreted by Protestants. It was the same at Birmingham, it was the same at Dublin, it was the same at Edinburgh, and it was the same at Liverpool. Nay, Mr. Finch, on the third day of the discussion at Liverpool, according to the printed report, did say that the *Protestant rule of faith was the Bible, interpreted by private judgment, and the assistance of the Holy Spirit*.

If Mr. Tottenham will not allow me to make remarks on private judgment, I think that he should not have fallen into the error which he committed in his opening speech, wherein he defined the Catholic rule of faith, (as it is considered by us not abstractedly, but practically,) to be scripture and tradition, *proposed and explained by our Church*. Moreover, he introduced into his speech a great deal upon private judgment and the authority of the Church, which was irrelevant to the question, if I am not allowed to consider interpretation by private judgment as part of the Protestant rule of faith. Having premised this much, I shall throw myself on your indul-

gence. I wish only to remark, that as I am not accustomed to public discussions, or to address great meetings, I therefore feel much less qualified than the Gentleman opposite to make that impression upon you which is desirable for the justice of the cause I am about to advocate. Still, I come forward strong in the security of my faith, and in my conviction of the doctrines I maintain; and I trust that I shall be able, before long, to transfer a portion of the conviction in my mind to the minds of my hearers.

Divine faith is necessary to salvation. This the Apostle has assured us in Heb. iii. 6, “Without faith it is impossible to please God.” Again, in Eph. vi. 16, the Apostle has exhorted us—

“Above all things taking the shield of faith wherewith ye shall be able to quench the fiery darts of the wicked.”

This faith is not limited by Christ to one or the other doctrine of belief; nor to the doctrines considered as the *most essential and fundamental articles of faith*, but it extends to *every doctrine of revelation*—“Go ye,” says Christ, “and preach the gospel,

“He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.”—Mark xvi. 16.

The term which our Saviour used is not applicable to the gospel only, such as we have in *the printed copies*, but it included all the doctrines which he came to teach—“Preach *the gospel* to every creature.” The Greek term for “Gospel,” “*Εὐαγγέλιον*,” signifies the whole of the good tidings which Christ came from heaven to communicate.

Moreover, faith can be but *one*, in Ephesians iv. 5, we are told there is “*One Lord, one faith, one baptism.*” Christ in like manner, came down from heaven to reveal to us *but one religion*. He could not have come to reveal contradictory doctrines, being the God of truth; therefore, to preserve this unity of doctrine, he promised to be with the teaching Ministers of his church even to the consummation of the world. Matt. xxviii. 20.

Hence, then, as he who does not believe the whole Gospel,—*the whole of the divine communications* of Christ, if duly announced to him, will, according to the declaration of Christ himself, be damned; in order that we may not lose the immense advantages purchased by the death of Christ, and arising from his divine communications, it is of the most vital importance, that there should be

*some manifest rule* to determine, amongst the immense variety of contradictory doctrines imputed to Christ, which is *the one true faith* he revealed, and by which alone we shall be saved. Is it, indeed, consonant to the idea we must have of the love and of the wisdom of Christ;—can we persuade ourselves, that he came down from heaven;—that he clothed himself with our nature;—that he engaged himself in three years of painful ministry;—that he sealed his doctrines with his blood;—that he gave to his Apostles instructions and injunctions that they should make the preaching of the word the principal object of their ministry;—and yet entertain so unworthy an idea of his wisdom and goodness as to suppose that—knowing the obscurity of human judgment,—foreseeing the infinite variety of interpretations which would be put upon an obscure rule,—and how unavailing such a rule would be to the salvation of men, he should not have appointed either some visible authority to determine the meaning of that rule, and to confine the wandering judgments of men, or that he should not have given a rule so clear, so precise, and so comprehensive as to suit the humblest capacity? We contend that, when Christ appointed the *rule of faith*, he did also establish a visible authority, determining the meaning thereof. *Protestants* deny the establishment of any such visible authority, and contend that the Bible alone is the rule of faith. Now, looking around you, and viewing the immense variety of contradictory sects, that disfigure the fair face of Christianity, all of which claim to derive their doctrines from the same rule of faith, which faith can be *but one*, do you not feel a *presumption*, at least, that Christ would not have established that *obscure rule*, which I shall shew *the Scriptures* alone to be, without some authority to determine its meaning? But I am anticipating my argument.—In order that we may enjoy the benefits of the redemption of Christ, and of the revelations which he communicated to men,—that we may escape that damnation which it is declared shall be the lot of those who reject *any of the doctrines* which he came to reveal, (provided those doctrines are manifested to them,) all are agreed that there must be some rule determining *what are* the doctrines of revelation. But in assigning this rule commences the difference between us. The sixth article of the thirty-nine of the Established Church declares—

“ Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that



whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

All Protestants, I believe, with the exception of the Quakers, subscribe to this doctrine, and the Reformation Society has added, that *upon the meaning of the contents of Scripture, every meanest outcast of society is commanded to exercise his judgment*. But this is a point on which I am not allowed to touch, and I will endeavour to keep clear of it.

We too maintain that Scripture is the unalterable word of God; we maintain (notwithstanding what that infamous publication *Popery Unmasked* may have insinuated and expressly stated, notwithstanding those false persuasions which have been attempted to be impressed on your minds, that we prefer the decisions of Popes and Councils to Scripture), we maintain that Scripture is entitled to our profound reverence, as being the unalterable word of the Almighty. The imputations against us, that we treat not the Scriptures with respect, the insinuations that we prefer the decisions of councils to the express declarations of the Holy Scriptures, these are some of the calumnies which have ever been directed against the Catholic Church. It has been acknowledged by many liberal Protestants that the Catholic Church has been assailed by the most cruel calumnies, and amongst them this is not the least. I will read to you a few of the opinions of liberal Protestants with respect to the calumnies which have been circulated against us. The Rev. Mr. Wix, Vicar of St. Bartholomew the Less, in his *Reflections on the Expediency of Councils*, with a view to the accommodation of the religious differences between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, in the seventh page of his preface says:—

"The Roman Catholics, it is believed, are greatly misunderstood, and cruelly calumniated. Truth requires this statement."

The present Bishop of Norwich, in a speech he delivered in the House of Lords on the 27th of May, 1808, expresses himself thus:—

"It is not a little singular that we will not allow the Catholics to know what their own religious tenets really are. In vain they most explicitly and most solemnly aver, that they hold no tenet whatsoever, incompatible with their duties either as men or as subjects. In vain they publish declaration upon declaration, in all of which they most unequivocally disavow those highly exceptionable tenets which are imputed to them, and not only do they disavow, but they express their abhorrence of them. Notwithstanding all this, a concealed jealousy of Catholics still lurks about by far too many of us—a

jealousy, in my opinion, as unworthy of a frank and enlightened people, as it is injurious and cruel towards those who are the objects of it."

The late Lord Donoughmore, in a speech delivered in the House of Lords in 1817, thus expressed himself on the Catholic question:—

"The Catholics have to complain that they are grossly calumniated; that they are shamefully misrepresented. The Catholics have to complain that their enemies have not hesitated to malign their character. The Catholics have to complain of abominable falsehoods, which are actively circulated against them. I have myself been furnished gratuitously with a collection of pamphlets on this subject, and from their tone and temper one would think it was the intention of the writers to revive those riots that disgraced the metropolis some years ago. These tracts have been industriously handed about to the Members of Parliament; and no means left untried to excite the public prejudice, and to rouse the popular feeling."

This state of things—the calumnies which have been directed against the Catholic Church, are what *that Church* ought to expect, which is the Church established by Christ; for we hear him declare in Matt. v. verse 12—

"Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceedingly glad, for so persecuted they the Prophets who were before you."

Again, Matt. x. verse 22—

"Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake."

Now it is not true that we hold the Scripture in irreverence. We consider it as the unalterable word of God; we prefer not to its doctrines the decisions of Councils or of Popes; and we admit no doctrine which can be shewn to be contrary to the declarations of Christ, as manifested to us in the written word. In what then is the difference between Protestants and Catholics on this head? Before I proceed farther, allow me to observe, that, if it should happen, in any thing which I may offer, that I cause any offence, whether it be to the feelings, or prejudices, or the conscientious belief of others, I shall give utterance to those expressions with regret. I was, as I said, unwilling to enter into public discussion; nothing but necessity could make me do so; and I am determined, as far as possible, to avoid any expression or argument which may justly be offensive to my present hearers.

*Protestants* maintain that *the Bible alone* is the rule of faith: *we* maintain that all *absolutely essential* doctrines are expressed in the Scriptures; *either in the conclusions themselves, or in the principles whence they are deduced.* This may, my friends, surprise some of you, but I will support it by references to the authority of some eminent theologians of the Catholic Church.



“The main and substantial points of our faith,” says Fisher, Ap. White, p. 12, “are believed to be apostolical, because they are written in Scripture.”—“All those things,” says the oft calumniated Bellarmin (*De verbo Dei non scripto*, l. iv. c. 11.) “are written by the Apostles, which are simply necessary for the salvation of all.”—The celebrated brothers de Wallenburch (in tract, *Gen. de Controv.* p. 239,) write thus: “It is true that the sacred Scripture contains all things necessary for faith and morals, if this be understood of those things which are necessary for all and every one.”—“What article of faith is there,” asks the learned Abraham Woodhead, in his rational account of the doctrine of Roman Catholics, p. 138, “except that concerning the canon of Scripture (which Protestants also grant cannot be learnt out of Scripture), and excepting those *practicals* wherein the Church only requiring a belief of the lawfulness of them, it is enough if they cannot be shewed to be against the Scripture, I say, what speculative article of faith is there, for which Catholics rest *merely* on unwritten tradition, and do not, for it, allege Scripture, I mean that canon of Scripture which Protestants allow.”

But, whilst we hold that almost every doctrine of religion is contained in the Scriptures, yet we maintain that there are *some few* doctrines which are *not expressly* contained therein; and that there are many others contained therein which *are obscure*. Of this we have a proof in the immense diversity of opinions which we find amongst those who make Scripture their only rule. We maintain, therefore, that Scripture is not *the only rule* of faith; that there are *some few doctrines* handed down to us exclusively, and *others more expressly* manifested, by the *unwritten word*, forming a *part* of the good tidings which Christ came from Heaven to communicate;—and *this* is called *tradition*. These two parts complete the rule of faith of the Catholic Church; of which we infallibly learn the true meaning, when that Church, with the teaching ministers of which Christ promised to abide, to the consummation of the world, after a rigorous investigation shall propose its doctrines to our belief. Yet even these traditional doctrines may, in one sense, be said *to be contained in Scripture*, according to the explanation of St. Augustin—

“We follow in this matter,” he writes, “even the most certain authority of canonical Scriptures... But although there be verily brought no example of this point out of canonical Scriptures, yet, even in this, the truth of the same Scriptures is held by us, when we do what is approved of by the *whole Church*, which the authority of the Scriptures themselves doth set forth; so that since the Holy Scriptures cannot deceive, whosoever is afraid of being deceived by the obscurity of the question, *let him consult that Church*, which, without ambiguity, the Scripture doth demonstrate to us.”—Aug. lib. i. contra Crescon, cap. 32 and 33.

In this sense there is no doctrine that we hold of which we do not find proofs in the Holy Scriptures.

Having entered into this detail for the purpose of clearing aside the misconceptions and prejudices which are in the way of my farther arguments, I proceed now to the

main business for which I stand before you ; viz. to prove that the Protestant rule, not being clear and comprehensive, and *certain* (not in respect to the rule itself, but to the weak judgments of those who derive their faith from it), this cannot be *the only rule* established by Christ. To complete my purpose, I should next proceed to shew that private interpretation is not the means for understanding the rule instituted by Christ ; but upon this point I am debarred from entering.

I shall accomplish the task I have undertaken, if I show you, first, that the Protestant rule is not substantiated by proofs either evident or presumptive ; secondly, if I show you that it is contrary to the express declarations of Scripture itself ; thirdly, if I convince you that it is denied in practice even by Protestants of every sect ; and, fourthly, if I satisfy you that it is surrounded by many other insurmountable difficulties.

In the first place, therefore, I maintain that the Protestant rule is not substantiated by any proofs, either evident or presumptive. The Protestant rule having been opposed, not much more than three centuries ago, to the rule of the universal church, and being at this day opposed to the rule of by far the greater number of Christians, it is of the highest importance that its proofs should be most unexceptionable. So clear should they be *in Scripture*, that being the only infallible authority which Protestants acknowledge, as to be incapable of any solution. For, as Protestants admit that there is no visible authority, whereby the real and true sense of Scripture may be determined, “ the very fact,” to use the words of a distinguished member of the Reformation Society, Mr. Gordon, on a former occasion, “ the very fact that it can be shewn that there is *any doubt* with regard to the meaning of the texts adduced, cuts away the foundation on which they rest.”

Now what are those manifest proofs that *Scripture alone* is the rule of faith, the *only* rule instituted by Christ ? The Rev. Gentleman who addressed you before me, entered somewhat at length into this subject ; but if you will examine privately the proofs he adduced (you will see them laid before you soon in the printed Report), you will indeed find those proofs demonstrative that Scripture is useful in many points ; that it is the word of God ; that it is recommended to the perusal of all mankind ; that it conducts to wisdom ; that it contains lessons of faith and morality ; and administers to the comfort of the heart of man. But these are

doctrines to which the Catholic subscribes; there is not a single one of them which we do not as willingly profess as our Protestant brethren; there is not one of them which we do not again and again in our discourses assert. Not one of these, therefore, affects the point at issue; not one goes far enough to show that Scripture is the *only rule* of faith, or that Christ determined that *no one* of the revelations which he committed to his Apostles, should be handed down to subsequent ages *by any other channel than the Bible*.

Amongst the proofs which were alleged by Mr. Tottenham in support of this proposition, one of the most formidable was in the 20th chapter of John, verse 31—

“ But these things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name.”

Hence it was argued, that the gospel of St. John contained all that is necessary for man to believe. Now this conclusion goes much further than the doctrine which it is brought to support, viz.—that the Protestant rule is the Bible, not *one* portion of it but *the whole*. For it establishes that the *gospel of St. John alone* is sufficient for the faith of Protestants. Nay, it goes still further, for St. John is not speaking here of the whole of his gospel. Dr. Clarke says, in his Commentary on this verse, that it relates *to two miracles only*, which are recorded in verses 19 and 26 of the same chapter, viz.—that Christ entered amongst his disciples, the doors being shut. Hence it would follow, that these two miracles alone, being “ written that you should believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God,” &c. are sufficient for salvation. Moreover *we* acknowledge that the greater portion of the gospels is written that we may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. But the question is, whether such portions *alone are sufficient* for our faith?—That is, whether they contain *all* the revelations which Christ willed should be handed down to his followers? This is the point at issue, and this is a point that my adversary has not proved. He cited the 17th of Acts, verse 11, where you find related that the Bereans were more noble than those of Thessalonica, because they searched the Scriptures. We, too, recommend those who differ from us to read the Scriptures; and we recommend Catholics also to read the Scriptures. We hold with St. Paul that the Bereans were more noble than those of Thessalonica, because they

did not reject his doctrines without examining the Scriptures, whether the proofs he adduced from Scripture were valid or not.

It has been insinuated to you, indeed expressly said, that the Scriptures are open to the clergy, but not to the laity of the Catholic communion. This, my friends, is one of those grievous calumnies which I spoke of at the commencement of my address, and which endeavours are made to impress upon you, even at this meeting. To convince you of the contrary, allow me to read an extract from a letter addressed by Pope Pius VI. to the Archbishop of Florence, dated Rome, April 1, 1788.

“ At a time that a vast number of bad books, which most grossly attack the Catholic religion, are circulated even among the unlearned, to the great destruction of souls, *you judge exceedingly well that the faithful should be excited to the reading of the Holy Scriptures*: for these are the most abundant sources which ought to be left open to EVERY ONE, to draw from them purity of morals and of doctrine, and to eradicate the errors which are widely disseminated in these modern times. This you have seasonably effected by publishing the Sacred Writings, *in the language of your country, suitable to every one's capacity*, especially when you show and set forth, that you have added explanatory notes, which preclude every possible danger of abuse.”

Pope Pius VII. in his Letter to the Catholic Bishops of England, dated April 18th, 1820, exhorted them in like manner to encourage their flocks to read pious books, particularly the Holy Scriptures. Prefixed to a translation of the New Testament into the French language, by P. Amelote, there are many declarations of approbation given thereto by the French Bishops. In like manner at the beginning of a Catholic Bible, translated into English, we have the approbation of the Irish Bishops thus—

“ This new edition of the English version of the Bible—we, by our authority approve. And, we declare that the same may be used with great spiritual profit by the faithful; provided it be read with due reverence and the proper dispositions.

“ Given at Dublin, 2d September, 1829. “ DANIEL MURRAY, D.D.”

“ We concur with the above approbation.”—[Here follows a list of Catholic Bishops in Ireland.]

Let not, then, the insinuation, which has so often been made, that we prohibit the laity from reading the Scriptures, be believed. If at any time such a regulation was made, it was not universal; and it was made under circumstances in which, I am convinced, many Protestants would approve of it. Indeed, many Protestants have expressed a desire that restrictions should be put upon the unlimited reading of the Bible.

THE REV. E. TOTTENHAM.

Mr. Chairman,—With regard to the observations which were made at the opening of Mr. Brown's speech, as to the origin of this discussion, I feel that most of them are quite unconnected with myself, or with the Reformation Society; and therefore, I shall not waste that period of time, which is allotted me, by referring to those matters, having others of more consequence to attend to. However, Mr. Brown stated, in reference to this meeting, and to such meetings generally, that they were not oftentimes productive of much good, but that they caused a great deal of excitement, and perhaps confusion, and that many, if not most, of the persons who attended them were brought together by mere curiosity.

Now, I am not one who will stand up to affirm that controversy is free from evils. I acknowledge that it *has* evils attending it, and that it is encompassed with danger; but then, at the same time, I contend that it is oftentimes a *scriptural duty*. What saith the Apostle Jude, in the 3rd verse of his Epistle?

“Dearly beloved, taking all care to write unto you concerning your common salvation, I was *under a necessity* to write unto you: to *beseech you to contend earnestly for the faith* once delivered to the saints.”

And, if we remember the conduct of the Apostle Paul, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, we find that he went into the synagogues, and into the market-place, and he *publicly disputed* with the people, shewing by the Scriptures that Jesus is the Christ. Therefore, though controversy, though discussion, may have their evils and dangers, which I am ready to admit, yet, at the same time, standing upon the authority of the Scriptures, we are not afraid of going onward in the Lord's strength.

Mr. Brown also stated something with regard to *the effect* of Reformation Meetings in general. He said, that he never knew an instance, so far as his experience went, of a person having apostatized from the Roman Catholic faith as the result of these meetings; whereas, he knew many instances to the contrary. I am not going to dispute with respect to this statement, though there may be many who have come over, notwithstanding Mr. Brown's want of knowledge on the subject. It is, however, a matter of no consequence to the present discussion. All

I would say, is, that if indeed Reformation Meetings have produced such wonderful results in favour of the Roman Catholic faith, I really think Mr. Brown should be glad that such meetings are going forward, and ought to seek to cultivate them, rather than express a dislike for them.

Now, Sir, to proceed. Mr. Brown complains that he has been hampered by not being allowed to consider the question of "private judgment;" he admitted that, abstractedly, it is not a part of the Protestant rule of faith, the Bible alone being such; but he feels it very hard that he cannot refer to the means by which the rule of faith is made known; and, then, in opposition to me, he produces the opinion of Mr. Finch and others, at a discussion at Bath. I stand, however, on my original position; I have given not Mr. Finch's, or Mr. Gordon's opinion, or that of any individual, but *I have given the standard documents of the Protestant Churches*: it is by them we are to be guided in this matter, and they assert simply that the Protestant rule of faith is, *the Scripture alone*, and do not add, "interpreted by private judgment." "But," says Mr. Brown, "if Mr. Tottenham will throw a chain around me, he should not have fallen into the same error which he deprecates, and brought forward *the Church* as a part of the Catholic rule." Now I think the cases are different, especially when I find that Mr. Brown (in one of his publications which I have with me) defines the Roman Catholic rule to be "*the written and unwritten Word of God proposed by the Church*." I say the cases are different for this reason; we do not admit private judgment to be a part of the rule of faith, because we do not admit it to be infallible; but the Roman Catholic contends that his church, which proposes the written and unwritten word, is infallible.

The sixth article of the Church of England has been referred to, and read again, which declares that "Holy Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation." Mr. Brown asserts that the Reformation Society has added, that the meanest outcast of society may interpret this word, by the exercise of his own private judgment, as he pleases. I remark here, that it was not the Reformation Society that added the right of private judgment, for I think it may be proved that this principle was admitted by many long before the Reformation Society was in existence. But here let me correct a mistake, into which Mr. Brown and other



Roman Catholics have fallen; no member of the Reformation Society, and no Protestant, who knows what protestant principles are, contends that a man may interpret the Bible *as he pleases*. We maintain that he is to exercise the judgment which God has given him, and for the use of which God will call him to account, and that “every man must bear his own burden.” He is called on to employ his powers of mind on the Scriptures, according to the rules by which he would ascertain the meaning of any other writing; and if he misinterprets and perverts them, he is answerable to God for it. We do not contend for the *perversion* of the Scriptures, but we contend for the *simple right*, established by Scripture and by reason. Be it also remembered, in this case, that there is one point continually kept out of view, when our adversaries speak of the exercise of private judgment—it is supposed we maintain that a man should proceed, *leaning on his own understanding*, to interpret the Word of God. Now we rejoice to know that there is a promise given of the HOLY SPIRIT to him who asks,—and that, therefore, when we tell a man to read the Bible, we do not tell him to follow his own fancies, but we point him to that source, from which he may derive light and instruction, for the understanding of what he reads. If a man reads the Bible in sincerity of heart, and looks to God for a blessing on the word read, we may be sure he will be preserved from error, and will be led into all necessary truth.

Mr. Brown has referred to the testimony of several liberal Protestants, in reference to the calumnies and misrepresentations which (he says) are continually uttered against Roman Catholics and their religion. He has quoted from the Bishop of Norwich, from the Rev. Mr. Wix, Lord Donoughmore, and others. Far be it from me, Sir, to advocate the misrepresentation of the Roman Catholic religion, or of any other; and what I have to say about that system I wish to say upon this principle:—take the word of no man, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, as evidence of the real state of things, but *take the acknowledged documentary authorities of the Church*. This is the way to judge of what a Church really holds: it is not to be discovered with accuracy from the statements of *individuals* on either side. Do you suppose I would admit that, whatever a man may choose to give as a version of Protestantism, should be

received by me as a true version? And our friends on the other side also disclaim the private opinion of any single theologian, as necessarily giving the sense of the Church. In reply, therefore, to Mr. Brown's remarks respecting misrepresentation, I say, we stand on the authority of such a book as the **CANONS and DECREES of the COUNCIL of TRENT**; on such books as the **CATECHISM** published by order of **POPE PIUS the FIFTH, &c.**; we desire to take our statements from those documents; and if we can do that, then they are not calumnies—they are not misrepresentations—they are not a private individual's opinions—but the positive declaration of *the Church*.

There have been some explanations given as to what a Roman Catholic holds, and what a Protestant, as the Rule of Faith; and Mr. Brown has asserted, that the Roman Catholic holds *that Scripture contains all things essential to religion*. Now I think that this assertion contradicts, at least in a measure, certain statements made by Mr. Brown in other parts of his speech. For example, in speaking of the necessity of faith, as deduced from the passage, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned," he said—"Faith is not limited to certain articles, but embraces all things supposed to exist under the term *Gospel*." And then, in a subsequent part of his speech, in explanation of what is *meant* by the *Gospel*, he declares that, besides what the written word reveals, there are "*some few doctrines handed down to us exclusively*, and others more expressly manifested, *by the unwritten word, forming part of the good tidings (i. e. Gospel) which Christ came from Heaven to communicate: and this is called tradition*." Well then—my argument is this:—if (according to Mr. Brown's statement) faith has a reference to *all* that is included under the term *Gospel*—if, by his own shewing, *part* of what is thus included is "*handed down exclusively*" in the *unwritten word*—and if the belief of the *whole*, when proposed, is absolutely *essential* to salvation—all of which things my reverend opponent has himself stated—then is it not evident, according to his principle, that there are "*some few doctrines*" *essential in their nature*, and yet *not* contained in Scripture, but *only* in tradition? Thus I think the legitimate deduction from certain principles advanced by Mr. Brown affords an instance of *contradiction* to his simple statement, that "a Roman Catholic holds that Scripture contains all things essential to religion."



With respect to this subject, Mr. Brown has referred to the oft calumniated man (as he called him) Bellarmine, and has quoted a passage from his writings; but I have another passage before me, and it is this:

“If we admit the authority of Constantine, I affirm that there are proofs in Scripture of all the doctrines which appertain to the nature of God, and that we may be fully informed of those doctrines from the Scriptures, if we rightly understand them; but *the true sense of the Scriptures depends upon the unwritten tradition of the Church.*”—BELL. *de verbo Dei non scripto*, lib. iv. c. 11, sec. 9.

Now, though I allow that Bellarmine does, in so many words, admit what Mr. Brown stated, yet when he puts that very strong adjunct, “*the true sense depends on the unwritten tradition of the Church,*” I contend that it is making unwritten tradition *superior* to the written word—if the meaning of the written *depends* upon the unwritten.

My Rev. opponent has noticed two texts out of the proofs I adduced in defence of the Protestant rule of faith, and I hope he will notice others in the course of this discussion. The first was the passage from the 20th chapter of John, and Mr. Brown contends that the conclusion from my premises would be, that *the Gospel of St. John alone* contains all things necessary to be believed for salvation. I set out with *admitting* that, and so far from thinking it makes against my argument, I contended, and still contend, that it strengthens it. What I have to maintain is, that the Scriptures, as we receive them, contain all things necessary to salvation; and if I can prove that *even in the single Gospel of St. John alone* all things essential to salvation are contained, then *much more*, I argue, are they contained in *all* the books of Scripture. So far therefore from overthrowing my argument, it is strengthened by the admission.

Acts the 17th chap. and 11th verse was alluded to by Mr. Brown, where it is said that the Bereans “sought the Scriptures daily,” &c. and Mr. Brown adds, “We recommend the reading of the Scriptures also.” But that is not the point in question; *the way in which I used the text has not been noticed.* I say, *the rule* by which the Bereans judged of matters of faith—of the things the Apostle preached—was *the Scripture*: there was no other rule to which they referred, and the inspired writer pronounces his *approval* of them for such conduct. It is not merely about *reading* the Scriptures that I quoted the passage; I contend it proves the duty of doing so, and also the right of private judgment; but I contend it proves,

thirdly, *that the written word is the standard by which we are to judge of matters of faith.* And mark the consequences, which I before stated; “many indeed of them *believed.*” There was the result, while they took the written word alone as the standard by which they judged of the doctrines preached by the Apostle.

Mr. Brown complains that it has been insinuated, or rather openly expressed, that the Scriptures are not allowed to the Roman Catholic laity. I do not recollect at this moment that I insinuated or expressed anything about the matter; however, Mr. Brown may be correct in his statement, and at all events I do not wish to evade this subject. I do not want to say that the Roman Catholic laity, especially in this country, are absolutely forbidden *all* use of the Scriptures, but I do say that the Roman Catholic Church *has imposed restrictions*, at times, upon the reading of those Scriptures, and *that* is quite enough for me: no Church has a right to do so. The letter of Pope Pius the Sixth has been adverted to—but there was another Pope, Leo the Twelfth, who published an Encyclical letter in 1825, and in this letter, in which he warned the Bishops and Patriarchs, to whom he wrote, against the Bible Society, what was the course that he pursued? He quoted the 4th rule of the *Index of Prohibited Books*, drawn up by select Fathers of the Council of Trent, and approved by Pope Pius IV. which I shall read to you:—

“Since it is manifest by experience, that, if Holy Bibles are allowed every where, without difference, in the vulgar tongue, *more harm than good* would arise from it, on account of the rashness of men, let the judgment of the Bishop or Inquisitor be abided by in this matter; so that, with the advice of the Parish Priest or Confessor, *they may grant* the reading of the Bible in the vulgar tongue, translated by Catholic authors, to those whom they shall have ascertained to be likely to derive no harm, but rather an increase of faith and piety from this sort of reading; *which permission they must have in writing.* But if any one shall *presume* to read or possess them *without such permission*, he may not receive absolution of his sins, unless he first deliver up the Bibles to the Ordinary.”

There is the original document itself—the rule of the Index which Leo the Twelfth quoted in his circular epistle, and in which the Irish Roman Catholic Bishops, in their pastoral letter, declared *they fully concurred.* What I say, then, is this; without maintaining that the Roman Catholic laity are universally forbidden the reading of the Scriptures, I say there is a *restriction* put upon the reading of them, *whenever the Church may think it desirable.* There is enough of error and impiety in this, for no man, and no church, has a right to restrict the reading of the

word of God. As well might I say to an individual, “do not lift up your eyes to gaze upon the heavens,” as say, “do not read the book which God has given you to lead you in the way to life everlasting.” Besides, our opponents are involved in an additional difficulty here, by having Pope Pius the Sixth *versus* Pope Leo the Twelfth.

Now I go back to one or two points to which Mr. Brown adverted. There were two arguments (though he did not enter fully into them, yet he put them forth, so that as I have an opportunity of answering them, I shall at once proceed to the consideration of them)—there were two arguments, I say, against the Protestant rule of faith—perhaps they may properly be called *one*. He says the Bible cannot be the only rule, for *it would be inconsistent with Christ's wisdom to give a rule which is so liable to misinterpretation and misconception*. Allow me, Sir, to enter my protest against reasoning of this description. We have no right to say what would be consistent, or what inconsistent, for Christ to do, except in cases where we can speak on the positive authority of revelation. That would presuppose that we knew what is right, and what is wrong, better than such a being. Our business is not with what God *ought* to do, but with what God *has* done: this is the matter we must debate. However, let us take the argument, that the Bible cannot be the sole rule of faith, *because it is liable to various and conflicting interpretations*.

In answering this objection, we may, first of all, refer to the divisions that existed in the primitive church. Let it be remembered that, though the Apostles were alive, and were invested with infallible authority, yet there were divisions in the early church; “one said, I am of Paul, another, I am of Apollos, and another, I am of Cephas;” and so on. Very well—if the divisions which exist among Protestants at the present day, be a valid argument against the Protestant rule of faith, then, upon the same principle, the divisions in the primitive church were a valid argument against the primitive rule of faith. So that Mr. Brown's reasoning *proves too much*—it proves as cogent with regard to the primitive rule, whatever that rule was, as it does with regard to the Protestant rule at the present day.

Moreover—it is too much to expect, in the present state of things, that upon the interpretation of *any* rule persons should be in *every particular* agreed. I maintain that every rule—no matter what it be—is *liable* to misconcep-

tion, because the contrary of this supposes *individual inspiration*. Look at the facts of the case, as respects the preaching of the Prophets, of Christ, and of his Apostles. I think it will be admitted that the words of the Prophets were spoken under the inspiration of God, and contained God's truth; that Christ's sermons, and those of his Apostles, did the same; yet many of them were misconceived and misinterpreted; therefore Mr. Brown's position would furnish as valid an argument against the preaching of Christ and his Apostles, and against the words of the Prophets, as it does against the Protestant rule of faith.

This is not all—it is argued against the Protestant rule that, because of these different interpretations, it could not have been the rule which Christ established. Let us try the Roman Catholic rule by this test; because, be it observed, there is scarcely a single argument, so far as I have ever heard, which is brought in opposition to the Protestant rule, that does not destroy itself *by being as much opposed to the Roman Catholic rule*. I shall shew that this is the case in the present instance. Taking the decisions of the Church, and the decrees of Councils, as giving an explanation of the Roman Catholic rule, we find that this *exposition* (clear as it may seem to some) *has been misinterpreted*. The history of the case proves the fact. In the Council of Trent certain decisions were given about Original Sin, Grace, and Justification. Now it happened that Soto, a Dominican, and Vega, a Franciscan, interpreted those decisions *differently*, each according to his own system. Soto published three books, and Vega fifteen, both of which were printed in 1548, and intended as a Commentary on the Canons of Trent.

I may also notice another instance, respecting the doctrine of Intention. When this subject was introduced into the discussions of the Council, an individual, named Catharinus, argued upon one side of the question, and he afterwards wrote a book, in which he endeavoured to prove that the decree of the Council was according to his opinion. However, we find Cardinal Bellarmine distinctly opposing the opinion of Catharinus on this subject, and telling us that he had mistaken the decision of the Council. I shall state Bellarmine's own words, as they occur in his third book on Justification:—

“I am not ignorant what is *Catharinus's opinion* with respect to Intention in the making of the Sacraments, but his opinion is proved to be *contrary to the definition of the Church*, as we have shewn elsewhere.”—BELL. de Justif. lib. 3, sect. 6.

So that, you observe, Catharinus published a book to shew that the Council was of *his* opinion, and Bellarmine contends that *he was mistaken in his judgment*. Therefore here we have two instances of the Roman Catholic rule being liable to the same objection so often urged against the Protestant rule; and consequently, Mr. Brown's argument *proves too much*.

There is another point in connection with this, which was urged by Mr. Brown, and which I said might be reduced to the same objection. He said Christ in his wisdom could not have given a rule *so obscure* as the Bible, and thus he argues, from the obscurity of the book, that it cannot be the only rule of faith. Now we admit there are difficulties and obscurities in the Bible, and we say, it was *to be expected* that there should be such in a revelation from God. We find that there are difficulties inexplicable in creation—difficulties inexplicable in the dispensations of Providence—but yet we can understand a very great deal connected with both. And just so with the word of God: there may be difficulties and obscurities, and these may be brought before us for particular reasons, but I contend thus much, that *upon all matters essential to salvation—upon all things connected with the covenant of grace—the Bible is plain*, and may be understood, if a man reads it in a right frame of mind, and looking to God for his blessing. We would advance some evidence of this fact. David says in the 118th Psalm, 105th verse:—

“Thy word is a lamp to my feet, and a light to my paths.”

Here he is speaking of the word of God existing in his time, which certainly was not so plain as the New Testament, and yet this is the language he uses with regard to it.

In the 118th Psalm, 99th verse, what expression do we find him using?

“I have understood more than all my teachers”—and why? “*because thy testimonies are my meditation.*”

This was the reason why David had more understanding than all his teachers, because God's law was his meditation. But it may be said that this is arguing from a particular to a universal, and therefore I shall refer to another text, to meet this objection. It is the 2nd Epistle of Peter, 1st chapter, 19th verse, where St. Peter speaks thus:

“We have the more firm prophetic word: whereunto ye do well to attend, as to a light that shineth in a dark place.”

There the Apostle Peter exhorts those to whom he wrote to attend to the word of prophecy, as being "*a light that shineth in a dark place.*" Now it is confessed on all hands that *prophecy is the most difficult part* of Scripture, and therefore if the exhortation holds good with respect to it, it follows evidently that the *other parts* of Scripture (which by all are confessed not to be so obscure as the prophecies), so far from being too difficult to be attended to, and to be considered as the rule of faith, are indeed, as David says, "a lamp unto our feet, and a light unto our paths." Therefore we say, that the argument arising from the obscurity of Scripture, is an argument of no validity, because Scripture itself testifies that in all essential things it is quite plain, and easy to be understood by the man of a teachable disposition, who looks to God for his blessing.

But upon this subject allow me to propose a few questions. We hear much of the obscurity of the written word. And I ask, first of all, this question—Did Christ and his Apostles *preach intelligibly*? If they did *not*—then, according to Roman Catholic principles, their preaching could not have been a sufficient rule of faith to those that heard them; but if they *did*, I should like to know how it happens that their sermons, *when spoken*, were so very *intelligible*, but that, *when written*, they should be so very *obscure*?

Again—we are told that an individual cannot understand the Scriptures, and therefore ought not to receive them as his only rule of faith. I ask, then, *how does the Church understand them*? If the Church understands the Scriptures by human means, and by the ordinary operations of the Spirit of God, then why may not individual Christians understand them in the same way, and by the same means? But if the Church does not understand the Scriptures by mere ordinary means, but *by actual inspiration*, then let our friends opposite account for the fact of the Scriptures *being written at all*. Because we might, *on that principle*, have received the truth from the declarations of the Church *without* Scripture, as well as *with* it.

Further—if Scripture be so obscure that a man cannot understand it without another word attached to it, or without the authoritative decisions of the Church, then we may ask, *how we should find out the Church at all*? We shall be referred to Scripture, at least as an authentic document, to prove the Church by; and certain texts will be adduced, which, we are told, speak of the great-



ness, glory, perpetuity, and infallibility of Christ's Church. But then, I ask, *how shall I know that I understand these texts?* I am very likely, according to the Roman Catholic principle, to misunderstand them, as there is no infallible authority yet discovered by me. This argument, derived from the alleged obscurity of Scripture, thus again *proves too much*. If it proves any thing against the Protestant rule, it proves as much against the Roman Catholic Church also. If we cannot understand the Bible (according to the Roman Catholic principle) without the Church, we cannot be ever sure that we understand aright *which is the true Church*.

Once more—if the Scriptures are so very obscure that we cannot understand them without the infallible decisions of the Church (that is, of Popes and Councils lawfully convened), then I may enquire, how the people could understand them *before the first Nicene Council in 325, A. D.* for that was the first Council held? We have just the same way, surely, that they had, and we may be contented with that way.

Mr. Brown said, in the course of the discussion he would advance four topics, of which the first was, that the Protestant rule of faith was not established by evident or presumptive proofs. I have adverted to a variety of passages on this subject, and Mr. Brown has hitherto replied to only two (at least attempted to reply, for it did not strike me that his answers did away with the distinct and palpable statements which the texts put forth). I hope the rest of the texts will also be noticed by Mr. Brown, and then it will be for our friends to judge whether they sufficiently established the Protestant rule of faith, or not. For let it be borne in mind, that we are at present destitute of a living infallible tribunal to go to, and therefore we are compelled in this case to exercise our private judgment. Hence, I say, it will be for our friends present, and for those that read the report, to judge whether the texts I have adduced to establish our rule of faith be sufficient, or not. When the Scriptures declare they are “able to make us wise unto salvation”—when we find Christ and his Apostles continually referring to *the written word*, as their rule and standard, and never to any other—when we find it was the only rule the Jewish Church ever had—it will require some strong line of argument to set aside the meaning of those texts to which I have referred on this question.

The Rev. Gentleman says he will also advert to the fact that our rule of faith is contrary to Scripture, but

until proof be adduced, I may be permitted to deny the assertion. At present there is nothing more for me to reply to. One or two particulars Mr. Brown has advanced, and I have endeavoured to meet them. As I have gone over these points, I shall now sit down, till I hear more on the subject.

---

THE REV. T. J. BROWN.

THE arguments adduced by Mr. Tottenham are, I feel satisfied, inconclusive; and, when you come to review those arguments, I think this will appear evident to *your* minds. Not one of his proofs goes far enough to shew that Scripture was established by Christ as the *only rule* of faith, or that Christ willed that *none* of his revelations should be handed to his followers *by any other means* than by the *written* word. So far as the texts go, you will find, as I before said, that they prove that Scripture is useful, that Scripture is the word of God, and recommended to the perusal of all men, that Scripture conducts to wisdom, that Scripture contains many admirable lessons of faith and morality; in fact, there is a *general commendation* of Scripture, but nothing to establish it as the *only rule* of faith, which is now the sole point in dispute. I shall therefore make no particular observations upon them as yet, because the weighty arguments which I have to adduce, will not permit me at present to review them in detail; but I will endeavour to consider them more fully in their proper places, before we separate.

With regard to the apparent contradictions between a former publication of mine, and what I just now asserted, I reply that if I did, at some period, say that *the written and unwritten word as proposed by the Church* is the rule of Catholic faith, I spoke of the rule considered practically, not abstractedly. So I admit that the Bible alone is the Protestant rule, when we speak abstractedly: but I maintain that if *practically* considered, as it was on several occasions by the Reformation Society, the private judgment of the individual enters into, and is a part of the Protestant rule of faith, as the authority of the Catholic Church enters into the Catholic rule. Abstractedly



speaking, therefore, the written and the unwritten word form the only rule of Catholic faith.

It was said that I was guilty of a contradiction in maintaining that all the essentials of religion were contained in the Scriptures, and yet contending from Mark xvi. verse 16, that we are strictly obliged to believe *every thing which Christ revealed*. I cannot discover the contradiction; perhaps I do not understand the nature of Mr. Tottenham's objection. This is what I distinctly laid down, that there are certain points of explicit belief which *are essential* to the salvation of mankind, and that *these are contained in Scripture*;—that there are other points *not so absolutely essential, so that when they are not proposed to individuals*, it is not necessary to salvation that they be explicitly believed. But from the declaration of our Saviour in Mark xvi. verse 16—

“Preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but *he that believeth not, shall be damned*”—

—from this declaration I contend, that whoever rejects *a single point* of the doctrines of revelation, when that point is properly proposed, exposes himself thereby to the sentence of damnation pronounced by Christ. In this there is no contradiction that I can discover. We are not obliged to be acquainted with every doctrine that Christ communicated; but, when they are laid before us, we are obliged to receive them, and every one who rejects any one of them, exposes himself to damnation.

It has been said that Leo XII. stands in contradiction to Pius VI. There is no such contradiction. Pius VI. recommended the reading of the Scriptures in the vernacular tongue, *when the translation is correct, and may be depended upon*. Leo XII. censures the translations of the Bible Society, because, he said, *those translations were false*: and in confirmation we have the authority of the Rev. A. P. Perceval, “Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty,” who, in the appendix to a work entitled “Reasons why I am not a Member of the Bible Society,” writes thus:—

“Surely it is enough to make a Christian's blood run cold, to think of the *sacrilegious presumption of a Society* which dares thus to tamper and trifle with the revelation of the Almighty, and dares publish to the heathen, and attempt to pawn upon its credulous supporters these school-boy exercises of its agents, as the sacred word of God! It is the circulation of such translations as these, that, more than once, at the meetings of this Society, have been blasphemously compared to the miraculous gift of tongues. And such a system is supported, and such comparisons applauded, by many who, on other occasions, lay claim, and justly, to characters of piety and intelligence.”

These are the Scriptures which Leo XII. condemned; not the authorized and accredited translation, which Pius VI. had approved; hence, there is no contradiction.

The rules of the Index placed, it is true, certain restrictions upon the reading of the Scriptures, with regard to certain individuals, but *only in those cases where the reading of the Scriptures might induce great injury to Christianity*, because there was at that time a tendency on the part of a multitude of men to put their own interpretations on the word of God, of which a variety of contradictory and dangerous explanations were given. The Catholic Church, claiming a divinely constituted authority, thought herself justified in putting restrictions upon those who were going to turn Scripture, by the abuse they made of it, to their own perdition and the injury of society.

The divisions spoken of in the primitive church are compared to those of the Protestant Churches: because one said, "I am of Paul," &c. therefore it is argued they are of the same character as the divisions among Protestants. Who can be deceived by such an argument? Do you not see that those were not divisions on points of faith? that Paul did not propose one doctrine, Apollos another, and Cephas another? The difference did not turn upon *any one point of doctrine*, but merely upon *predilections for this or that preacher*. How different were they from the divisions amongst the Protestants of these times, when *one maintains as an article of faith what another rejects*.

I laid down four points, which I shall endeavour to establish. First, that the Protestant rule is not substantiated by proofs either evident or presumptive; secondly, that it is contrary to express declarations of the Bible; thirdly, that it is denied in practice even by Protestants of every sect; and fourthly, that it is surrounded by many other insurmountable difficulties.

I have spoken with regard to the Protestant rule not being substantiated by *evident* proofs; I shall now speak to the presumptive arguments regarding it. And first I remark, that whatever *presumptive arguments* may be adduced in favour of the Protestant rule of faith, those arguments are not sufficient for the purpose for which they are alleged. They may shew that a certain doctrine is very probable, and may go so far as to establish its moral certainty, but this is not sufficient for divine faith, which excludes all doubt whatever. For divine faith rests

not on *presumptive argument*, but *exclusively upon the manifest word of God*. Therefore, whatever presumptive arguments may be adduced, they alone will not be sufficient to support the Protestant rule of faith. But I maintain that presumptive argument is most decidedly against the Protestant rule.

Were it indeed the design of God that Scripture should be the only rule of Christian faith, surely our wise and benevolent Legislator would, in his instructions to his Apostles, have intimated that the written word was to be the only rule of faith; that therefore they must apply themselves to preserve in writing the divine communications which he had made to them; and it is inconceivable that the Apostles would have omitted to leave some record of such directions, both for the satisfaction of future ages, and for the greater authority of the written word. Now there is *no presumption* to this effect; but quite the contrary, as I will shew you—1st, from the language of Christ and his Apostles—2ndly, by the conduct of his Apostles—and, 3rdly, by the conduct of the primitive Christians.

First, with regard to the language which Christ held to his Apostles, we find that frequently, in his addresses to them, he speaks of their communicating the doctrines of revelation *by preaching*, but we find *nothing whatever* of the doctrine of faith being handed down *by writing or Scripture*, and still less *by Scripture only*. In the 10th chapter of Luke, verse 1st, it is said,

“After these things he appointed other seventy also, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place whither he himself would come.”

I quote from the Protestant Bible, as my adversary does from the Roman Catholic. In Mark xvi. verse 16, Christ said—

“Go ye into all the world, and *preach* the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that *believeth not shall be damned*.”

In Matt. xxviii. verse 19—

“Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

It was *by preaching* therefore that Christ willed that his doctrines should be communicated; and there is no intimation given by him in Scripture that they should *be written*, and so conveyed to future times.

St. Paul, in like manner, in innumerable places refers to the commission given to him and the other Apostles, that they *should preach the Gospel*; but no intimation is given by Paul that he was to *write*. It was *by hearing*,

he tells us, that faith was to be received, not by the *written word*, addressed to *the eye*.

“ Faith cometh by *hearing*, and hearing by the word of God. But I say, have they not heard? Yes, verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the end of the world.”—Rom. x. 17, 18.

Paul also, stating the nature of the commission he had received, for the performance of which he was to be held responsible, declares, in 1 Cor. ix. 16—

“ For though I *preach* the Gospel, I have nothing to glory of: for necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me if I *preach not the Gospel*.”

There is no mention here concerning the *written word*.

Now let us look in the second place at *the conduct of the Apostles*, and see if any of them hold out thereby a presumption in favour of the mode of communicating the doctrines of revelation by writing, or of their having been *commanded* by Christ *to write*, or any *intimation* to the effect that Scripture should be not only *the rule* of faith, but *the only rule* of faith, to *the exclusion of all unwritten revelation*.

If the Apostles were convinced that there was a *divine injunction to write*, would they not instantly have obeyed? Would they not without delay have applied themselves to the duty imposed upon them? Yet we find that Matthew, the first of the inspired writers of the New Testament, suffered *eight whole years to elapse* after the resurrection of Christ, *before he penned his Gospel*; nay, Le Clerc, a Protestant minister of great celebrity, maintains that it was *not till twenty-eight years after* the resurrection of Christ that he produced it. St. John, another of the Apostles, neglected to apply himself to the execution of the duty (if such it was) of writing the Gospel, *for upwards of sixty years* after the resurrection of Christ. Is there here *any presumptive proof* that the Apostles considered themselves *bound to put into writing* the truths to be handed down to future ages?

Indeed the presumptive arguments are to the contrary; for it is quite manifest that the Scriptures were the result of *fortuitous circumstances*, and *that they were not penned by a divine injunction*.—We are informed by Eusebius, in his 3rd book of Ecclesiastical History, c. 24, that Matthew penned his Gospel when he was about to leave Judea, in order to preach the faith to the Gentiles; that so he might leave behind him to the Jewish converts a testimony of the doctrines he had taught. It appears, therefore, not to have been written in fulfilment of the injunctions of his

Divine Master, but for other purposes.—Of Mark we find it related, in the 2nd book of Eusebius, c. 15, on the authority of Papias and of St. Clement of Alexandria, that he also wrote his Gospel, not to fulfil a divine command,—but that, when he was about to go to take possession of his see at Alexandria, he might leave a testimony of the doctrines he had preached.—St. Luke tells us, at the commencement of his Gospel, the motives which induced him to write it—

“*Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us which were from the beginning eye-witnesses, and ministers of the word ; it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed.*”—St. Luke, chap. i. verse 1 to 5.

It was therefore to counteract the false and erroneous statements of other writers that St. Luke wrote his Gospel, and not to comply with a divine command.—St. John wrote his Gospel more than sixty years after the resurrection of Christ; and we are informed by Irenæus in his work against Heresies, b. iii. c. 11, and by St. Jerome, in the 9th chap. of his “*Catalogue of Illustrious Men,*” that John wrote, not because he deemed it incumbent upon him to do so for the sake of future ages, but only, *at the earnest request* of the Bishops of Asia that he would counteract the errors of Ebion and Cerinthus, who denied the divinity of Christ. Hence there is every reason to presume that, had not those errors existed, we should not have had the important Gospel of John. Is there here any reason to presume that the Gospels were written as the only rule of faith for future ages?

There is incontestable evidence to shew that the Epistles were, in like manner, *the result of fortuitous circumstances*. If we look into them we find that they were written to put an end to the contests between Jews and Gentiles; to repress scandals; to humble those who gloried in the works of the law; to correct various errors; to thank for the relief administered to the wants of their fellow Christians; to support those who were under affliction; to counsel those who were in difficulty; to reconcile those who were at variance. There is no intrinsic evidence whatever in the Epistles, any more than in the Gospels, that they were *ordered by Christ to be written* as the rule of faith, the *only rule* of faith for future ages.

Again, had the Apostles received such a commission

from their Divine Master, would they have acted as they did? Of the *twelve*, would *five only* have discharged the duty imposed by him? Would *two only* have written Gospels? Would not the rest at least have subscribed to the writings of the others? Would they not have put their hand to the work, to testify their concurrence, and their common faith in the doctrines contained therein? It is inconceivable that the Apostles would have acted otherwise. Moreover, what, may it be presumed, would have been the form in which they would have handed down the revelations of Christ to coming times? Instead of one book of Scripture being unconnected with the other, instead of the abrupt transitions we meet with, instead of the obscurity which darkens the pages of the sacred volume, there is every reason *to presume*, at least, that we should have found Scripture written somewhat after the form of a catechism, clear, methodical and simple, in such a manner that *the weakest capacity might ascertain the meaning of this only rule*. Reason naturally leads us to conclude that this should have been the manner in which the Apostles would have written, if Christ had intended Scripture to be *the only rule* of faith, so that no revelation was to be handed down except by the medium of writing. But let us look attentively at the conduct of the Apostles. We find them going to disseminate the doctrines received from Christ; Andrew to the Scythians; Thomas to the Bactrians, Hyrcanians, Medes, and Parthians; Philip to the Phrygians; and others to many remote and barbarous nations. Did they take Bibles to distribute amongst their new converts? We find no proof whatever of it. We find merely that they *preached* the Gospel, not that they gave a single written copy. We read only that St. Bartholomew took with him a copy of St. Matthew's Gospel into India, for the purpose of making known the conformity of his doctrines with those of the other Apostles.

I know that an objection may be started here, which may perhaps have occurred to my friend Mr. Tottenham, for it was brought forward on a former occasion by Mr. Gordon; it was to this effect:—"How can we Catholics deny that the Apostles wrote in conformity with the command of Christ? Did not they write under the inspiration of the Spirit of God? Were they not, then, commanded to write?"—This is an evasion of my argument. I maintain only that the Apostles were not ordered to write the



Gospel by Christ as *the only rule of faith*:—that they were not commanded to commit *to writing all the communications* they received. When therefore the Holy Ghost moved them to write, truly they were commanded to write; but they were commanded to write only so far as the fortuitous circumstances which led to their writing required.

Now then let us pass, in the third place, to the conduct of the primitive Christians, and see if they give us any reason to suppose that they understood the Scriptures alone to contain all the doctrines which they were to receive. Had they thought so, it is indeed reasonable to presume that they would have taken pains to *disseminate copies* of the Gospel; that they would have sought means to extend this only rule of faith; and therefore that they would have *multiplied copies* of it: for their wisdom and zeal would not have been less than those of modern times. They would accordingly have instituted something in the form of our parent and auxiliary Bible Societies: it is reasonable to imagine that they would have collected funds and formed Sunday Schools for the purpose of making the people acquainted with their only rule; that they would have given translations of the Scriptures, for the use of those who understood them not in the original language; that they would have had recourse to all those means which the wisdom of this age has brought forward? Now, is there any proof in antiquity that the primitive Christians had recourse to those means? There is no proof; on the contrary, I will shew you that the proof is on the other side.

I maintain, then, that as the rule of faith given by Christ was meant for all ages, that as it was for early as well as for subsequent times; therefore, a rule which was inaccessible to Christians in the primitive ages, could not be the rule, *the only rule*, instituted by Christ. I request you will attend to this argument. Have you ever reflected upon the impossibility of Christians in the first ages possessing themselves of the sacred volume? The copies being exceedingly scarce, and the labour of transcribing being very great, so much so that a man's life would not in many instances suffice to write out in manuscript (for it was long before the art of printing was discovered) from the beginning to the end of the sacred volume. This labour rendered the work very scarce and very expensive. It has been calculated (I believe it is far under the sum) that a copy of the Scriptures in the early

ages would have cost from 30*l.* to 40*l.* of our money!! A Reverend Gentleman, in a letter which he circulated a short time since in this neighbourhood, attempted to cast a reflection on Catholics, because they sold the Bible at 16*s.* I happen to have an excellent copy here, which was sold at 8*s.* having also many useful tables and notes. But if he taunts the Catholics for selling the Bible at 16*s.* what must he say of the primitive Christians, *who could not have sold* a copy for less than 30*l.* or 40*l.*? Is it not lawful then to suppose that the Bible was not the *sole rule of faith*, when it was *so inaccessible* to men in the 2nd and 3rd centuries, and down to the 15th, when printing was introduced?—But, suppose the Bible could be obtained for 3*s.* or 4*s.*, yet it would still have been *ineffectual* for a sole rule of faith; for *it could not have been read* in the primitive ages. During many centuries, until after the art of printing was introduced, thousands were not able to read, nay, it is calculated that *not one in 500 throughout the universe was able to read*; there are proofs in some cases that *not one in a province* was able to read. *How then could the Scriptures be the only rule of faith?* Yet you will recollect it was said, that the doctrines of Christ, *thus written*, were to be *the sole rule* of faith for all men and for all ages. But I appeal to common sense, whether *a rule which could not be obtained*, or, if obtained, *could not be read*, could be *the sole means* of communicating the revelations of the will of God to man?

Again, suppose all could read, yet they could not all understand foreign languages; and yet Christianity was for all the universe. I shall now challenge my adversary to prove that the Scriptures were, until the 5th century, translated into the African, Celtic, Illyrian, or Scythian languages; yet these were the only languages understood by a large portion of Christians, for many ages before. St. Augustin, in his 2nd book *De Doctrina Christiana*, c. 13, tells us, that the Psalms were commonly sung in Africa in the Latin tongue; yet we know from his writings that it was not understood at that time by the people of Africa. Could there have been translations of the Scripture into the popular language when Augustin wrote this? If so, would the Psalms have been sung in Latin, when the people did not understand that language? And why were there no translations made? Does not the indifference of the primitive Christians about translations shew that they held their rule of faith by *tradition and the authority of the*



*Church*, and not by the reading of the written word? Accordingly, we have the authority of St. Irenæus for this, in his 3rd book against Heresies, cap. iv. p. 205 :—

“ And had these Apostles left us nothing in writing, must not we, in that case, have followed the rule of doctrine which they delivered to those to whom they entrusted their Churches? *To this rule many barbarous nations submit, who, deprived of the aid of letters, have the words of salvation written on their hearts, and carefully guard the doctrine which has been delivered.*”

It was from oral delivery, therefore, and not from the written word, that these barbarous nations derived their knowledge of the truths of revelation. Now, if the 6th article of the 39 Articles of the Established Church be correct in pointing out the Scriptures as the rule of faith, and if these were the *sole and exclusive rule* for Christians in the first and subsequent ages, *it follows that an immense majority of the primitive Christians were excluded from the possession of this rule* and the use of it, and from the means of transmitting it to future times. Is it conceivable that such an institution as this is stamped with the wisdom and authority of the Divine Legislator? Would, I ask, and I repeat it, fearless of the manner in which my adversary has taken up this argument, would a loving and wise Saviour have established *an only rule*, involving such difficulties, nay, impossibilities? We have a right to *presume* that he would not act contrary to what common sense suggests. What human legislator, in giving laws to those dependent upon him, if such laws cannot be put into their hands, or but a few can get copies of them, does not establish a visible and supreme authority to expound them? Yet *you form your faith by your own judgment*, exercised upon such a rule. You may pray to God indeed to obtain assistance: but Christ foresaw that the prayers which would be addressed to him would not preserve *the many sects*, that disfigure the features of Christianity, *from varying and differing without end*, as to the meaning of the rule handed down by him.

I will here anticipate an objection which is likely to be produced ;—that these are only *accidental* evils, that they do not *necessarily* follow. But if they did not necessarily follow,—they were *at least foreseen*, and my argument returns, that Christ, *who did so much for us, and loved us so much*, would not have given a rule on which he foresaw that so many difficulties would occur. It may be told us, in the last place, that if the early Christians could not read the Bible, they could at least *have heard it read* by others. But here fresh difficulties present

themselves ;—they might have heard *parts*, but they could not have heard *the whole at the same time* ;—they might have heard it at different times and in different portions, but thus they would not have been able to collate passages, so as to form their faith upon them ;—the reader might not have been deserving of implicit credit ;—the reader might not himself have understood the meaning of what he read ;—*there were no stops* at that period to direct the reader, and he might easily have been misled. Again, in whole provinces it might have happened, and it must have happened, that not any one could read (for there were few in the early ages capable of reading,)—consequently, that could not have been the rule, *the only rule of faith* established by Christ, which was *open to so many difficulties*. If it had, its meaning might have been easily lost ; and when once lost, it would have been difficult, if not impossible, to recover it. Therefore I contend, according to the principles which I have laid down (and thus I conclude my first argument), there is no proof, either evident or presumptive, that the *Bible alone* was the only rule of faith established by Christ, whereby his doctrines were to be handed down to future ages.

I contend in the *second* place, that the Protestant Rule is *contrary to the express language of Scripture*. And here we claim the right of private judgment as well as you, my friends, upon this matter. We claim it according to your principle ;—upon the principle that “ every meanest outcast of society is commanded to judge of the meaning of Scripture.” By this principle of the Reformation Society, and of Protestants in general, we too must be allowed to exercise our judgment. We, therefore, by the exercise of our judgment, come to the conclusion that Scripture is not the *only* rule of faith, since we find that another rule is therein warranted, as I shall shew you ; and that, moreover, an authority is pointed out, to determine the sense of the rule.

What right has the Reformation Society to come forward here, to question and challenge us upon exercising that right of private judgment, which *they authorize* the meanest outcast to exercise ? Why do they interfere with that, over which they have no control ? For if, by *the divine command*, we are bound to exercise our judgment, no man I contend has the least right to interfere with that divine command. He is acting contrary to the disposition of God, if he does not say : “ each of you is bound to ex-

ercise his own private judgment; it is not then for me to come and give a bias to *your private* interpretation; since *by it* you are bound to stand or fall." Even in the outset, therefore, I maintain that the Reformation Society is acting against its own principle, in thus coming forward and arguing against us for exercising our judgment upon the interpretation of Scripture.

Now I contend that it is contrary to the language of Scripture itself, to hold that the Bible is *the only Rule* of Faith. For I shall shew you, *first*, that *all* the communications of Christ to his Apostles *are not contained in the Scriptures*; *secondly*, that *the Apostles expressly declare* that, instead of writing all the doctrines which they proposed to deliver, *they reserved many for oral communication*; *thirdly*, that these oral communications *are called traditions*, and that measures were provided by the inspired writers *for preserving those traditions to future ages*.

My first position is, that all the communications of Christ to his Apostles could not be contained in the Scriptures; but as my time is almost out, I will prefer not to enter into its proofs at present.

---

THE REV. E. TOTTENHAM.

You will recollect, Sir, that, in my opening speech, to establish the entire sufficiency of the Protestant rule of faith, I adduced a variety of texts, both from the Old and New Testaments. Now I shall just observe, that I cannot be content with the mere general reply which Mr. Brown has given to them. I have advanced a very great number, and, in my judgment, they apply very much to the point, and I expect, therefore, something more particular in reply. It will not do that these sweeping answers should be given:—"they merely prove that Scripture is useful; that it conducts to wisdom," and does a variety of other things that have been mentioned. I have alluded to these texts, not for the purpose of merely proving all this (though I think they *do* prove it), but for the purpose of shewing that Scripture was used for something farther—namely, that it is *the standard* by which truth and error are to be judged.

Mr. Brown has asserted again that all essential points

are conveyed in Scripture, and other points, *not essential*, are conveyed by tradition. First of all, I hope Roman Catholics will take advantage of this admission. If all necessary things be contained in Scripture, I trust they will take great heed in receiving any thing but what Scripture reveals. I say, moreover, they should not depend very much on what the Council of Trent declares. For if the written word contains all essentials, and if what is in the unwritten word are only matters of minor consequence, then, according to this reasoning, the unwritten word would not be a thing of so much importance as the written word, seeing that the one contains essentials, and the other non-essentials. But what says the Council of Trent? It declares that "unwritten traditions" are to be received "*with equal piety and reverence*" as the written word of God.—Concil. Trid. Sess. IV. de Canon. Scrip.

With regard to the "Rule of the Index," though this does not fall precisely within the discussion before us, yet it has been said, in extenuation of that rule (which, I think, is evil enough, and requires great extenuation), that it is *only used in reference to those who are likely to be injured by the perusal of Scripture!* Here I make the same remark as I made before, that no man, that no body of men, have a right, *upon any pretext*, to keep the Bible from any individual. Though it be encompassed with difficulties, yet, if the simple fact be true, that God has made a revelation of his will to man, and that that revelation is at least complete in all essential points—then I say, it is a first principle that the Bible should be read, and no man should restrict the reading of it. Such a proceeding is just a stepping in between God and man, for if God gave the word, he intended it should be read; and therefore the "rule" in question was wrong in this point, even with all Mr. Brown's extenuation of it.

Respecting the divisions in the primitive Church, it was said, that my argument derived from them was not valid, because they were not on points of *faith*, whereas the divisions of Protestants *are* on points of faith. I deny that the divisions among Protestants (at least among orthodox Protestants) are upon essential points of faith; they are upon minor matters of church discipline, and church government, and other things which, however important in their way, are not essential to salvation. But I maintain that *the great body of professing Protestants agree in essential matters of faith*; and we shall find, if we consult

their authorized formularies (and I have with me the “Harmony of the Confessions” of different Protestant Churches), that they will decide that point at once. Therefore this excuse, that the divisions amongst Protestants are upon matters of faith, whereas, the primitive divisions were *not* on matters of faith, does not go for much.

But against the Protestant rule Mr. Brown has argued, that whatever presumptive evidence may be adduced in favour of it, yet we must remember, that presumptive evidence is never sufficient. It only, he says, produces moral certainty, not actual demonstration. Allow me to reply by saying that *we are believing and acting every day of our lives upon moral certainty*, and we do not refuse our assent to things simply because they are not capable of being proved in the way of mathematical demonstration. A philosopher of great celebrity said, “some things are *incapable* of demonstration,” yet they are *as fully believed* to be true, *as if they could be actually demonstrated*. How do we know, for example, the genuineness and authenticity of any book; take any ancient historian, or any of the poets; or how do we know (suppose none of us in this place have ever been in India) how do we know, I say, that there is such a place? We have no actual demonstration that there is, nor have we actual demonstration of the authenticity of any ancient book. Why do we then believe that there is such a place as India, or that such a book is authentic?—*simply on the ground of moral certainty, arising from a species of evidence which we deem worthy of credit*. Therefore presumptive evidence, upon this principle, may in the present case be admitted as a valid kind of argument.

The next point adverted to by my opponent was this:—“If,” says he, “the Bible was to be the only rule of faith, surely Christ would have *written, or commanded his Apostles to write*, the Scriptures—but he did neither.” And then Mr. Brown adds, that “the writing of the books of Scripture was in many cases the result of mere fortuitous circumstances.”!! In reply to this (although the observation has been anticipated in part) allow me to say, that, in my apprehension, this objection against the Protestant rule of faith amounts, practically, either to a denial of the inspiration of the Scriptures, or of the Deity of Christ. For, if the Bible were written by men divinely inspired, that is equivalent to a command, because the writing of the books must, in that case, have been according to the

mind and will of God. To deny this, is to deny the inspiration of them. Then, if Christ be one with the Father and the Holy Ghost, in the essential unity of the Godhead, and if the writers of the Scriptures were inspired by the Holy Ghost, the writing of the books must have been in accordance with the mind of Christ: to deny this, is to deny the essential unity of Christ with the Father and the Spirit. Mr. Brown does not say that he denies the inspiration of the books, but that the writers were only directed to write portions of the divine communication. I stand, however, upon the simple fact of *inspiration*; which is more than a command, because it is an actual coming down of the Holy Ghost upon a number of men for the writing of the word. Thus, then, if the Bible be inspired (which Mr. Brown admits), it amounts to the same as if Christ had given a direct command to write the Gospels and the Epistles.

But it is said—"Christ wrote nothing himself," and therefore the Bible is not to be considered as the rule of faith. A very strange argument, truly! I might parallel it with this—"Christ baptized no one himself—therefore baptism is not a Sacrament!" I think this argument is as good an one as the other, and the parallel at once exposes the sophistry of it. However, though I contend that an actual command to write is not necessary in order to prove the Protestant rule of faith to be a sufficient and the only one,—yet; were we called on to do so, we could produce many express commands on the subject. However, I shall not dwell at present upon these, but refer to a remarkable passage of St. Augustine, whose name has already been mentioned. He says:—

"This first is to be discussed, which some are accustomed to object to—why the Lord himself wrote nothing? *Pagans chiefly start this objection.*"  
 Aug. de consen. Evang. lib. i. c. 7.

Again—Id. cap. 25:—

"When they (the Evangelists) wrote what he showed and said, it is by no means to be inferred that he himself did not write; since *he, as the head, dictated* what his members put down; for whatsoever he wished that we should know of his deeds or sayings, *he commanded to be written as by his own hands.*"

In this place St. Augustine argues for the fact of inspiration, and he makes inspiration amount to just the same as if God had in so many words commanded the Scriptures to be written. The argument, then, that I have been combating, goes for nothing, so long as it is admitted that the Scriptures are inspired.



We were told also to look at the conduct of the Apostles. "They did not go at once and write the Scriptures. A long time elapsed before the Canon was completed: in the case of one book, twenty-eight years, and in that of another, sixty. Instead therefore of writing in the first instance, they went forth *to preach*." We have had a variety of texts adduced from Mark, and other parts of the Bible, to prove what certainly was never denied, namely, that the Apostles were oral teachers, and went forth to preach the Gospel. We fully admit they did; and we know that St. Paul tells us the great extent to which he went in order to accomplish this object. But it is a very extraordinary argument truly, that, because in the first instance they went forth to *preach* the Gospel, therefore they were not under the actual necessity of *writing* what they first preached, for the purpose of being the rule of faith. Now, why did they go forth to preach the Gospel first, and delay the writing of the books for some time? The answer is evident. They went to preach in the first instance, because they were *living and infallible authorities themselves*, and they proved the truth by astonishing *miracles*. The rule of faith, therefore, of the primitive Church (until the last Apostle passed off the stage of life) was the Old Testament Scriptures, coupled with the oral preaching of the living inspired Apostles. But then provision was made, as they were gradually passing from this life, and God doubtless foresaw the uncertainty of oral tradition, as proved in the case of the antediluvians, and therefore the Apostles, before they left the world, *committed to writing* the things they preached. Consequently, we have the same rule as the primitive Church, only in a different way. *THEY had the Old Testament and the oral preaching of the Apostles—WE have the Old Testament and the preaching of the Apostles committed to writing.* This is just the way of accounting for the matter; and if any thing be wanting to confirm this statement, it is to be found in a passage of Irenæus, who, when arguing against certain persons that depreciated the Bible, and were advocates for traditionary teaching, says:—

"We have not known the economy of our salvation by others than those by whom the Gospel came to us, which they then *first preached*, and, by the will of God, *delivered in writing*, to be the foundation and pillar of our faith."

Iræn. adv. Hær. lib. iii. c. 1. p. 198. Ed. Lond. 1522.

There is precisely the same explanation that I have given of this matter. They did not write *at first*, because

they were *living teachers, inspired by the Holy Ghost, and invested with miraculous powers* in attestation of the truth of what they delivered; but then they took care, and were guided doubtless by the Spirit, *to commit the truths they taught to writing before they passed from this life.*

Another point that has been advanced on the opposite side is this:—"If the Scripture was to be the only rule of faith, we should have expected it to have been written *in the form of a catechism.*" I must say in reply, this is just the species of argument which was before used, and certainly not a very palatable one to me, not by reason of its strength, but simply because I think it goes into *presumption*, and involves language that mortal man has no right to use. It is arguing upon *our notions* of what God *ought* to do, instead of looking upon what he *has* actually done: and therefore I do not think it will have weight with those individuals who feel properly on the subject. It is, in fact, making the action of God *dependent* (so far as the principle is concerned) on the action a creature would perform.

It was said, moreover, "if the primitive Christians had understood that the Bible was to have been the only rule of faith, they would have doubtless multiplied copies and translations." I will just shew the fallacy of this argument by a parallel. If the primitive Christians believed that the Gospel was the message of salvation to mankind, doubtless they, and all those who have lived in the faith during the eighteen centuries that are past, would long since have had missionaries in all parts of the world to teach men that Gospel. Whereas, the fact is, that nothing like a moderate portion of the world has as yet been visited by Missionaries; and hence I maintain, that upon this principle, we might as well argue against the truth of the Gospel (upon the belief of which the salvation of the soul depends), as for Mr. Brown to argue against the Bible being the only rule of faith, because the primitive Christians did not multiply copies and translations.

"But the Bible," we are told, "was inaccessible in the early ages, and therefore it could not have been the rule of faith." I would ask, was the written word indeed *so very* inaccessible then, or is the written word so inaccessible now? I think, however, this point will apply with double force *against the Roman Catholic rule*, for (according to Mr. Brown's own statement) I think *that a very inaccessible rule indeed!* much more so than the Bible



ever was—especially to the poor man. In a pamphlet which I hold in my hand it is asserted, in answer to the question, “*Where are the traditions which form a portion of the rule of faith?*” that—

“Many appear in the decisions of several general Councils, and may be easily met with by consulting either the *Creed of Pope Pius the Fourth*, and the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, or persons versed in Theology and Ecclesiastical History. It is PROBABLE (!) also, that there still remain some other divine traditions, regarding points upon which the Church has not yet decided, preserved in the writings of the Fathers, and in the custody of the Universal Church, to be elicited, whenever circumstances shall render the decision of the Church, or, in other words, their production, necessary, by the same means as have been adopted in times past, from the Council of Nice to the Council of Trent.”—Substance of the arguments used at the Cheltenham Discussion, by the Rev. T. J. Brown, S. T. P. p. 41.

The Bible cannot be the rule of faith, they tell us, because it was, or is, *inaccessible*. I should like then to know, *how a Roman Catholic can get at his rule in the present day?* Not to speak of the Bible, he is to look for it in *traditions*, some of which are to be found “*in the decisions of several general Councils!*” Where is he to get those decisions? First of all, there is an immense number of them, and in the dead languages: and then comes another question, *How does he know what Councils are universal, and what are not?* and until he can decide that, how is he to know which is the proper authority? I shall shew, if it be required, that there are three divisions of opinion in the Church of Rome, as to what constitutes the universality of Councils! The poor man thus has to decide what Councils are universal, and what are not; and suppose he arrives at the truth upon that subject (which I think a more difficult task than the Protestant has to perform), then the decrees, after all, are *in a language unknown to him!*

The explanation in Mr. Brown's pamphlet proceeds—“It is probable” (but it is only probability, there is no certainty) “that there still remain some other traditions regarding points upon which the Church has not yet decided, *preserved in the writings of the Fathers!*” There are an immense number of the Fathers, whose works are in the Greek and Latin languages, and so numerous, that scarcely one man in every hundred years reads them all through; and these are surely very tempting volumes for a poor man to peruse! How can he find out what are, and what are not, divine traditions? he must have a discriminating mind to come to a right conclusion upon this subject.

Then we are told—"Many may be met with in the Creed of Pope Pius the Fourth, and in the Catechism of the Council of Trent." But I say, if he cannot consult these documents in the original, *the poor man is taking the matter upon trust*: for, properly speaking, in order to have actual certainty (actual demonstration, which Mr. Brown contends is necessary to establish the Protestant rule), the Roman Catholic should consult *the original documents themselves*, in these and other cases, locked up as those documents are in large folios, and in the dead languages! If he cannot consult these, and also be satisfied that they are divine, then he has no practical rule of faith at all, but takes the matter merely upon trust. Mr. Brown, therefore, has no argument on the point of inaccessibility, because the Roman Catholic rule is ten times as inaccessible as ever the Protestant rule was.

A parallel was attempted to be drawn between the conduct of a human legislator, and what was supposed to be the conduct of God in giving a rule of faith. It was said, "would a legislator give a written law, without other means of interpreting that law? certainly not; and therefore it is natural to suppose that God, in giving his written word, would have appointed some additional means." Now the parallel does not hold good, and for this simple reason:—we all admit that human laws are *imperfect*, but God's law is always *perfect*: and it does not follow that, because an imperfect human law requires a judge or an interpreter, therefore, to expound a perfect law from God, a living infallible interpreter is necessary.

Some charges have been brought against the Reformation Society for coming here, and disputing with Roman Catholics, because we had no right, we are told, to interfere with the exercise of private judgment. I beg to assure Mr. Brown, and my friends on the other side, that I do not find fault with them for the exercise of their judgment; on the contrary, I am anxious that Roman Catholics universally should exercise it. I am constantly endeavouring to persuade them so to do. I know indeed that if I came to *force* their judgments, I should act inconsistently, because force on my part would be quite incompatible with the free exercise of opinion upon theirs. I merely come to use lawful means for the purpose of leading them to the proper exercise of their private judgments, and therefore the charge against the Reformation Society, of inconsistency with their own principles, does not hold good.

I have ten minutes more, and I shall now proceed to another subject, but one intimately connected with the rule of faith. The Roman Catholic holds the twofold rule, Scripture and Tradition; whereas the Protestant holds but one, the Scriptures, the written word of God. Now there is a difference again here *as to what is meant by Scripture*. The Protestant admits all the books that are “commonly received,” excluding those that are called the Apocrypha: the Roman Catholic, on the other hand, *adds the Apocrypha* to the canon of Scripture, and it forms an essential portion of his rule of faith. A question then arises here, as to the authority of these books, and it is one of great importance in this discussion. Now I contend that there is not a shadow of tangible evidence for their divine authority, and I invite them to produce, on the other side, evidence of the inspiration of those books.

In disputing their authority, I would remark, in the first place, that **THE JEWISH CHURCH NEVER RECEIVED THE APOCRYPHA INTO THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE**. I have here the testimony of JOSEPHUS, the Jewish historian, who must have known the whole matter, and who says:—

“We have not an innumerable multitude of books, disagreeing from, and contradicting one another, but *only twenty-two books*, which contain the record of all the past time; which are justly believed to be *divine*. And of them *five belong to Moses*, which contain his laws, and the tradition of the origin of mankind till his death. This interval of time was little short of 3000 years. But as to the time from the death of Moses till the reign of Artaxerxes, King of Persia, who reigned after Xerxes, *the Prophets*, who were after Moses, wrote down what was done in their time in *thirteen books*. The remaining *four books* contain hymns to God, and precepts for the conduct of human life. It is true, our history hath been written since Artaxerxes very particularly, *but hath not been esteemed of the like authority with the former by our forefathers*; because *there hath not been an exact succession of Prophets since that time*; and how firmly we have given credit to these books of our own nation is evident from what we do; for, during so many ages as have already past, *no one hath been so bold as either to add any thing to them, to take any thing from them, or to make any change in them*; but it is become natural for all Jews, immediately and from their very birth, to esteem these books to contain *divine doctrines*, and to persist in them, and, if occasion be, willingly to die for them.”—Josephus, contr. Apion. book i. sect. 8. This quotation is also to be found in Eusebius Eccl. Hist. lib. iii. c. 9, 10.

Here you observe, that we have it, upon the testimony of Josephus, that the Apocryphal books were not received by the Jews, for he specifies twenty-two, which are just the number in the Protestant canon.

But this is not all the proof we have that the Jewish Church did not hold those books as canonical, though this might be sufficient. We have also Bellarmine’s admission on this subject. He says:—

“All these books (*i. e.* Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and the Maccabees) *are rejected by the Jews*, as the blessed Jerome testifies. Almost

all the heretics of this time follow the opinion of the Jews."—Bell. de verbo Dei. lib. i. c. 10. de libris Tobiae, Judith, Sapientiae, Ecclesiastici, et Machabæorum.

Then he specifies several individuals who had followed the opinions of the Jews, such as Luther, Calvin, and others. So far for Bellarmine's testimony.

I may add the testimony of Du Pin, the Roman Catholic historian, who, in his "Complete History of the Canon," after stating that the Canon of the Jews was probably drawn up by Ezra and Nehemiah, has the following language:—

"There are some authors who pretend that the Jews have since made one or more canons; that they have added to the former the books of Tobit, Judith, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, and the Maccabees; but *this is not founded on the testimony of any creditable author*; and to me it seems plain that the Jews *had no other canon besides that of Ezra*, nor acknowledged any books as sacred but *what it contains*. For what can be opposed to the testimony of Josephus, St. Jerome, and St. Epiphanius, who assert this in positive terms?"

Hist. of Can. book i. c. 1. sec. 2.

In this place Du Pin not only asserts that the Jews did not receive the books in question, but he also brings in the testimony of Josephus, Jerome, and Epiphanius. In the next section he adduces the authority of Josephus again in proof of his assertion, and then he gives the testimony of Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, Origen, and several other Fathers, whose authority will be admitted on the opposite side. He gives them, I say, in support of the fact that the Jews did not receive the books commonly called Apocryphal, into their canon. Then let us take this fact as indisputable, which rests not only on Jewish authority, but also on that of Roman Catholics; for, in addition to what has been already advanced, the Preface to the Maccabees, in the Roman Catholic Bible, admits that those books were not received by the Jews.

With this fact we may couple the declaration of the Apostle Paul, in the third chapter of Romans, where he says that "*to the Jews were committed the oracles of God*." It is often argued by members of the Church of Rome, that the Jewish Church was infallible; but this argument only applies against them in the present case, because, as we have seen, the Jews did not receive the Apocrypha, and "*to them were committed the oracles of God*." Now, if the Jewish Church were infallible, it must have been *infallibly right in rejecting the Apocrypha*—and therefore those books are not to be reckoned in the canon of Scripture.

But again, Sir, if negative evidence may be adduced

against the Apocrypha, it is furnished by THE CONDUCT OF OUR LORD AND HIS APOSTLES, WHO NEVER RECOGNIZED THEM IN THE SLIGHTEST MANNER DURING THE WHOLE PERIOD OF THEIR MINISTRY. We find them continually quoting from the books of the Old Testament. There are about 600 references to the Old Testament in the New, and though they refer to the other books which were received by the Jews, yet *you do not find the slightest reference to the books called Apocryphal*. Now this silence on the part of Christ and his Apostles is a *negative* testimony of some importance, while, on the other hand, we have the *positive* testimony before adduced, that the Jews did not receive those books.

I go a step further, and assert, that not merely were those books not received by the Jews—not merely were they not recognized by Christ and his Apostles—but also THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH IS DECIDEDLY AGAINST THEM. In the first Catalogue, which was drawn up by Melito, Bishop of Sardis, in the 2nd century, the Apocryphal books are not included. In the 3rd century, we have Origen's Catalogue, as given by Eusebius. In the 4th, two by Athanasius, three by Epiphanius; and Catalogues also by Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nazianzen, Ruffinus, Hilary, Jerome, &c. &c. upon which I cannot now dwell particularly. I have the Catalogues here; if they should be called for, I can read them in the course of to-morrow. *Not one of them put the disputed books into the canon*. Besides, the Council of Laodicea, which was held about the year 370, and whose canons were received and incorporated into the canons of the general Church (having been admitted by two general Councils) *excludes* those books from the canon of Scripture: and this we learn from Du Pin himself.

Here you see how the case stands as it regards EXTERNAL EVIDENCE. We have, *first*, positive evidence of the Jews not receiving the Apocrypha, derived from the testimony of Jews and Roman Catholics. *Secondly*, we have the negative evidence of our Lord and his Apostles having never referred to them—and, *thirdly*, we have a variety of Catalogues, ten or twelve in number, in the early ages of the Christian Church, all excluding them from the canon.

I ask, if there be any Council earlier than that of Carthage in 397, which does admit them? We have thus a threefold external evidence against them. As I cannot go

*fully*, at present, into the *internal evidence*, which is very strong, I shall not enter upon it. I shall rest to-day at this point. To-morrow, if it be the will of God that we meet together, I shall proceed to internal evidence, and endeavour to shew that the books in question have no right upon any evidence, external or internal, to be received as canonical Scripture. We shall afterwards have occasion to consider other branches of the Roman Catholic rule of faith.

---

## THE REV. T. J. BROWN.

WE have had a long dissertation upon the Apocrypha, and we are threatened with a longer one on the same subject to-morrow. May I be allowed to say that the question of the Apocrypha bears very little upon the subject before us. The question to be discussed was the rule of faith, and it was understood that it was the *Protestant rule* of faith which was to be discussed, and *not the Catholic*; for when I had the private interview which led to this discussion, I said to the delegates of the Reformation Society, "I am willing to meet you upon fair terms: if you choose to attack any point of our doctrines, allow me to impugn a point of your doctrines." This was agreed to; and the point selected by me was the rule of faith; and certainly it was understood that I was to attack; I was not to be put on my defence to-day. Next week the Catholic doctrine was to be impugned, but this week the Protestant Rule of Faith is to be discussed. I will leave it to the honourable feelings of my opponents, whether my explanation is not correct. Upon this question of the Apocrypha, then, I ought to have, strictly speaking, nothing to say, for my arguments are against the Protestant rule of faith. I shall have something, however, to say of the Apocrypha, but not to-day.

I stated that I would adhere closely to my line of arguments, because each argument adds force to the other. I shall, however, notice briefly a few objections which were brought against me, in the last address of Mr. Tottenham. He tells me that he will not be contented with my answer to his texts; that they must be more particular.

I am, however, addressing myself now, not to Mr. Tottenham, but to the meeting; and the reporters present will state his arguments, and my answers. Whether they are too general or sufficiently particular, whether they do or do not meet the points in dispute, will then be seen, when they go forth before the public. But I rest satisfied that the general answers given are sufficient to set at rest the objections from Scripture which he has adduced. Were I to follow him through all his texts, the three days would elapse before I should be able to bring out the arguments which I esteem essential to impugn the doctrine of the Protestant rule of faith. Premising this, I go to consider other charges which he has brought against me.

He taunts me with putting myself in opposition to the Council of Trent. I said, he tells you, that the unwritten traditions are not equal in authority to the written word; whereas the Council of Trent says both are to be received “with equal reverence.” If I did say so, I expressed myself obscurely; my meaning was different, and I do not think my words were such as they are represented to have been. I said that in the written rule were contained the essential doctrines of Christianity, but that there are matters of less essential moment handed down by tradition. This I stated to shew how we reverence the written word of God; but I did not affirm that the unwritten traditions were not equal in authority to the written word in the sense that the Council of Trent means. The Council of Trent says we are bound to receive both “with equal reverence;” and I put it to you, whether, whatever doctrines Christ communicates, be they the doctrine of redemption, without explicit belief in which we cannot be saved, or any less important doctrine, whether one or the other is not to be received with equal reverence. Both are to be received “with equal reverence,” though one is not so important and vital as the other.

Mr. Tottenham argued most sophistically, that presumptive evidence produces a *moral* certainty, equal to a *metaphysical* certainty. I deny, however, that upon presumptive evidence, or metaphysical certainty, you can ground an act of *divine faith*, or that there can be *any divine faith*, unless where there is the word of God,—unless you allege the testimony of the Holy Spirit. Faith does not rest upon *presumption*, nor *metaphysical certainty*, but it rests upon that certainty (to the exclusion of all



doubts whatsoever), which originates in and is founded upon the unerring word of God, and that only.

Again, Mr. Tottenham insinuated against me a charge of infidelity, for not admitting that *inspiration* to write, was equal to a *command*, on the part of Christ. Now, I did not say that inspiration was not equal to a command; I admitted that it was equal to a command. But I held that we are not assured that there was any inspiration given to the Apostles, or command issued by Christ, to communicate by writing *all the doctrines delivered* by our Divine Saviour. On this, then, turns the controversy, not whether the Apostles were commanded or inspired *to write at all*, because I acknowledge that they were inspired, so far as they did write; but whether they were commanded, or whether they were inspired, to hand down *by writing all the doctrines* received from Christ, for the instruction of the faithful? No proof, I maintain, can be adduced to this effect from the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, nor from any declarations of Christ.

Again, an argument was put into my mouth, thus:—“Christ did not write, therefore, Scripture cannot be the rule of faith.” Now, if I did contend that Christ did not write, *nor give a command to his Apostles that they should write*, especially that they should write *ALL* the doctrines which they received from him; yet still we do not deny that Scripture is a rule of faith, and that all the most essential articles of belief are contained in Scripture; but, that it is the only rule.

Here I must remove a false notion which is still entertained of what I mean by essential doctrines. By essential doctrines I mean those without belief in which it is impossible for any man to be saved; for example, we cannot be saved without faith in the Redeemer; we cannot be saved without faith in the Trinity of Persons, and the Unity of the Godhead. These are primarily essential. There are other articles less essential. With regard to these, a man who *cannot come to the knowledge of such doctrines*, because they are not proposed to him, still may be saved without an explicit belief in them. But suppose these doctrines are communicated to him,—that he is made sensible that Christ has revealed them,—then his refusal to believe any doctrine, however unessential it may appear, subjects him to the damnation which Christ pronounced against those who believe not:—“He that believeth shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned.” This then is the



difference between what is essential, and non-essential ; without belief in the essential doctrines, it would be difficult for us to plead any excuse, but with regard to the doctrines which are *less essential*, the ignorance of a man will excuse him. A man is not expected to have an explicit belief in every part of revelation, but every individual is highly culpable before God, who excludes from his belief any one article *that is made known to him* of the revelation through Christ.

This argument also was palmed upon me :—“ Scripture cannot be a rule of faith, because it is not arranged in the form of a catechism.” I used no such reasoning. I only alleged, as a *presumptive*, not a decisive argument, that Scripture was not the *only* rule of faith, without a visible expounding authority, because it was not written in that form which reason suggests that the All-wise God would have inspired, had he enjoined the Scripture to be written for the *only* rule of faith. But, said Mr. Tottenham, as well may it be argued that the primitive Christians did not believe that the preaching of the Gospel was necessary to save mankind, or they would have sent missionaries to preach it in all parts of the world. Yes! they would have done so; they did so; and my adversary must know that the Gospel was carried by apostolic preachers to every part of the globe. The word of God was disseminated wherever there was an opportunity of its making progress in infidel nations; but there were often such obstacles (as there are now in China and other countries), that the Gospel could not be propagated therein, because the civil laws excluded the preachers.

I come now to the proofs of my second position, that it is contrary to the express language of Scripture to hold that the Bible is the only rule of faith. In the first place, all the doctrines of revelation could not be contained in Scripture. In John xxi. 25, it is said—

“There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written, every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books which should be written.”

Is it probable that Christ, who *did* so much, that the whole world could not contain the books that might be written of his actions, should have *spoken so little* as is contained in the few pages of the New Testament? Or does the Apostle mean to say, that all the other things which Christ spoke *were of no consequence, and did not deserve to be preserved?* We know that to assert this is to

assert impiety, for every word which Christ uttered was the word of eternal truth.

In Acts i. 3, it is said—

“To whom (*i. e.* the Apostles) also he shewed himself alive after many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.”

Here again there are communications made *during forty days* after the resurrection; yet we find very little in Scripture, of that which Christ delivered to his Apostles during that period. “By the kingdom of God,” in Scripture so frequently mentioned, we understand the Church which Christ came to establish. Now we know that the greater part of the Gospel relates to communications which Christ made *before* his resurrection, and very little to those which he made, and which pertained *to the kingdom of God, after his resurrection*. What became of the remainder? What proof have our opponents that *all of them* were committed *to writing*, and are contained in the few pages of Scripture? By rejecting the unwritten word,—by affirming that there is nothing to be believed but what is contained in Scripture, they proclaim, that much of those communications, pertaining to the kingdom of God, did not survive the first century, and thus they charge the Apostles with the enormous guilt of setting no value upon them, and of taking no means to transmit them down to future times. Just now, however, I shall have occasion to shew that the Apostles *did take means to hand them down*. I will shew that *by tradition* they handed them down.

But what do we mean by tradition? It is proper that I should explain here what we mean by that term. We do not mean, as I recollect a former champion of the Reformation Society wished to make his hearers believe, we do not mean that traditions are matters delivered down *by memory from Christ to the present time*; in that case you might be astonished how it was possible they could have been preserved. By traditions we mean all the revelations communicated by Christ for the purpose of being transmitted to future ages, which *are not written in the inspired books of the New Testament*. We do not, however, exclude writing; on the contrary, we look for our traditions to the writings of the first and subsequent ages. There is not a doctrine of tradition which we do not find authorized by the written belief of the first ages. I apprehend there are not any that we do not find in the writings of the first, second, third, or fourth centuries, and we

discover almost all in those of the first and second centuries. Accordingly, the Catholic Church, secure in the promise of Christ, delivered in Matt. xxviii. 30, that he would be with his Apostles and their successors to the end of time; secure in the promise made in John xvi. 13,—“When he, the Spirit, shall come, he shall guide you into all truth;” secure in the declaration of the Apostle in 1 Tim. iii. 15, where the Church of God is called the pillar and ground of the truth; secure in these assurances, the Church collates the writings of the Fathers, and judging by their morally unanimous testimony, it discerns true traditions from false. Hence the answer to the objection which is put forth so triumphantly: “How can the ignorant Catholic wade through the tomes of the Fathers, and discover that which is said to be handed down by tradition?” My answer is short,—*he is not called upon to do so*; for, besides the testimony of the word of God, we hold the expounding authority of the Church. As to the objection, that the ignorant Catholic has no knowledge of his own to support him, it is a subject not belonging to the present controversy, to which my adversary wishes to lead me off. But I reply, that he has the authority of his Church on which he rests, secure in the promises of Christ. The Church examines the traditions which its Bishops and Pastors have handed down from age to age; and a Catholic receives these doctrines of tradition as he does the interpretation of Scripture, upon the authority, in his belief the unerring authority, of the Church.

And here let me offer one word upon our exercise of private judgment. Mr. Tottenham says he wishes Catholics to make use of their private judgment. We do so; and it is by it that we arrive at the certainty we have of the unerring authority appointed by Christ to preserve us from danger of mistaking his revelations, whether contained in the written or unwritten word.—I will now tell you briefly how the Church proceeds. She proceeds with the greatest caution, carefulness, and sagacity. She does not admit every sentiment of the Fathers, for we hold not the Fathers to be *personally* infallible. This is one more of the calumnies which has been again and again brought against us. We do not then say they are each one infallible. No! we receive the traditions of the Fathers, because we believe that the *morally unanimous consent* of the Fathers manifests the doctrine held by the Church at the

times in which they lived, and because Christ has promised that he would abide with his Church to the consummation of the world.

The Church, therefore, when it proposes tradition, or the unwritten word, as when it expounds the Gospel, or the written word, first invokes fervently the assistance of the Holy Spirit. The Church requires also that the testimony of the Fathers should be clear and positive, that it should be morally unanimous, and declaratory of the belief of the ages in which they wrote. Now, when we have these characters combined; when we have this clear, positive, and unanimous testimony; manifesting, not the private sentiments of the Fathers (for many of these we reject), but the belief of the ages in which they flourished; when the Church takes such pains to discover the true meaning of the Fathers; when we rest upon the promises of Christ to his Church, that it should not lead us into error, and hear St. Paul declare it to be the foundation and pillar of truth; I appeal to you whether we ought to be condemned for preferring, to the contradictory interpretations and opinions of our adversaries, the venerable doctrines of those great and good men, whose sanctity Protestants admit in the Calendar of their Common Prayer-book, who lived in ages termed by Protestants pure, whose learning is acknowledged, and whose works are perused and admired by Protestants themselves.

Having explained what is meant by tradition, and, I think, shewn that, while we rest upon authority, we make not a sacrifice of private judgment; but that by the clearest light of private judgment we are warranted in maintaining and adhering to the doctrines of the primitive ages,—I proceed with my *second* argument.

The Apostles, I maintain, expressly declare that, instead of writing all the doctrines which they proposed to deliver to their followers, they reserved many for oral communication. I first appeal to St. Paul, who, in the 1st of Cor. xi. 34, says,—

“And the rest I will set in order *when I come* ;”  
and in Heb. v. 11,—

“Of whom (Christ) *we have many things to say, and hard to be uttered.*”  
The answer I dare say will be, that they were written afterwards, and that these things are to be found in some other parts of Scripture. This is the answer which certain learned Protestants have heretofore brought forward; for I should remark, that there is no argument advanced now, that has not been often urged during the two or three

centuries of disputes between Catholics and Protestants. But it is a mere gratuitous assertion, which wants proof. In the meantime, let it be remarked, that the Epistle to the Hebrews, wherein St. Paul declares that of Christ he “has many things *to say*, and hard to be uttered,” was written in the year 65, about a year before the death of St. Paul. He wrote it the *very last of all* his Epistles, except the first and second to Timothy, and the Epistle to Titus. I ask, what proof is there that these *many things* concerning Christ which he had to say, and which were *then* hard to be uttered, are contained in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus?

In the 2nd Epistle of St. John, verse 12, the Apostle says—

“Having many things to write unto you, *I would not write with pen and ink*; but I trust to come unto you, and speak face to face.”

Here the Apostle declares that he did not write, and that *he did not intend to write the doctrines, which he wishes to deliver*. In his 3rd Epistle, verses 13 and 14, he says—

“I had many things to write, but I will *not with ink and paper write* unto thee; but I trust I shall shortly see thee, and we shall speak face to face.”

Now these two Epistles of St. John were written, at the very earliest, about the year 66 of the Christian era, that is, *after all the rest of the New Testament was written*, except the Gospel of St. John, and the Revelations. Nay, more, there are some learned biblical critics who maintain that these two Epistles were written in the year 96 of the Christian era, *after the Gospel of St. John*; and that no work was written, except the Revelations, subsequently to these Epistles: yet the Apostle declares there are *many points* which he has *not written*, which he *would* “*not write* with ink and paper, but which he trusted to speak face to face, when he came to them.” Here, then, is a very strong argument in favour of doctrines communicated solely by unwritten tradition.

It is very likely that I shall be asked—(I anticipate the objection, because I can introduce its solution better in this place to support my argument,) “How have your traditions been preserved?” But, first, I shall also beg an answer to a similar question—How were the traditions preserved before the time when the Mosaic law was given? From the creation of the world to the time of Moses is included a period of 2,500 years; during all that time there was *no written law*, and the doctrines of salvation could only have been maintained by tradition. If they

could have been preserved 2500 years without writing, it is not very difficult to imagine how doctrines could be preserved by tradition 1800 years *in the writings of the Christian bishops and pastors*. Secondly, In the 14th verse of St. Jude there is a prophecy of Enoch, who was translated 3000 years before St. Jude wrote. How was this preserved? *Not by writing*, but only by the memory of man, at least it cannot be shewn that it was communicated at all in writing. Thirdly, In the Jewish law there were several unwritten traditions; and Chamier, a celebrated Protestant minister, acknowledges that the most essential doctrines were not clearly contained in the law; that until the time of David there was no distinct assurance of the immortality of the soul, of the resurrection of the body, of heaven or of hell; therefore these doctrines must have been preserved in the old law by tradition. Fourthly, There must have been in the old law some substitute for circumcision that could be applied to children before they were eight days old, when only that rite was to be administered to them. How was this doctrine preserved, except by tradition? Fifthly, Now I will tell you how our traditions have been preserved, and it is not difficult to satisfy the inquiry. They were preserved by the writings of the fathers. They were preserved by the vigilance of the bishops and pastors of the Church: for having received communications which they were to hand down to future times, they would be diligent in the discharge of their trust. Hence we see that whenever novelties were attempted to be introduced, the ministers of the Church appealed to the writings of those who had gone before them. There were other circumstances which prevented the possibility of traditions being lost; for if any of them had been neglected by the Catholic Church, there existed heretics from the first ages down to the present time, who were always watchful to discover any failure in the Catholic Church; so that had it omitted any doctrine previously taught, they would have loudly protested against such a falling off, and they would have appealed to the unerring testimony of the fathers of the preceding ages against it. Consequently there was a moral impossibility that tradition could be neglected. Again, finally, there was the protection of God. For if God promised to be with his Church to the consummation of the world; if, as St. Paul testifies, the Church was to be the pillar and ground of all truth, if the Spirit of God was to be with it to guide it into the truth, God would have



prevented the failing of traditions, and preserved the recollection of them so long as it should be necessary for the Church to retain them. Thus the creed of the Apostles was preserved until the end of the 4th century. St. Austin tells us that it was not allowed to be written, but to be preserved by memory only; and we have no copy earlier than that which at the end of the 4th century is presented to us by Rufinus. Our traditions I was called upon to enumerate; something also was said about the difficulty of coming at those traditions, of their being scattered through the ponderous tomes of the fathers, &c. whence it would follow that it is extremely difficult to discover what is tradition and what is not. I answer, then, that it is not necessary to enumerate those traditions. The Church, whose authority we discover, by the exercise of our private judgment, *this Church teaches us*, whensoever belief in this or that doctrine, known by tradition, is necessary; and we are secure in the promise of Christ that we are not going astray when we abide by the decisions of the Church: so the pastors of the faithful instruct each one according to his ability in whatever is necessary to be believed explicitly.—Another observation I request to make is, that the doctrines for which we are dependent upon tradition, I have explained to be those of less essential moment, with regard to which an implicit belief is sufficient, including a disposition to believe them explicitly, so soon as they shall be proposed upon the word of God.—Where are they? I answer, as heretofore, that they are contained in the writings of the Fathers, in the canons of councils, in theological treatises, in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, and other such books; but I repeat that it is not necessary for every Catholic to acquaint himself explicitly with each point; it is sufficient if he acquaint himself with them according *as the Church shall point out* the propriety or necessity of his acquiescing therein, forasmuch as they are proposed to him as being contained in the word of God. This method, in some measure, applies to Protestants, not less than to Catholics, with regard to many doctrines which Protestants only implicitly believe. Nay, Protestants are involved in much greater difficulties than Catholics have to encounter; for Protestants, who receive their doctrines solely from the written word, are obliged to satisfy themselves, *by private judgment*, what doctrine is to be, at present, *explicitly* believed, and what they may leave undetermined to a future time; and thus they run a great risk (which is proved by the contradictions amongst

themselves) of incurring that sentence of damnation which Christ pronounced against those who reject *any one* of the doctrines which he came to establish.

This brings me to an assertion that was made—namely, that Protestants do not differ on *matters of faith* ; or, as it was afterwards said, on *essential* matters of faith. How can any one dare to come before an assembly composed of persons of contradictory creeds, one admitting another rejecting the doctrines of reprobation and free grace, others holding different tenets upon the sacraments, a fourth party maintaining a different belief respecting the attributes of God,—how can a minister of the Established Church come forward, saying, “the difference amongst Protestants is not upon *matters of faith*?” You who are Methodists, you who are Baptists, do you not make acts of faith upon points in which you differ from each other? The Baptist differs from the member of the Established Church, and the member of the Established Church from the Methodist, and the Methodist from the Unitarian.—Is there not a difference even upon essential matters of faith amongst you? Before I conclude my arguments I shall be able to make this point much clearer than I do now.

I proceed to the third proof of my second proposition, that the Apostles expressly termed their oral communications *traditions*, and provided measures for handing down to future ages these unwritten doctrines. I adduce first the 2 Thess. ii. 15 :—

“Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the *traditions* which ye have been taught, whether by *word* or our *epistle*.”

I beg to remark on this passage, first, that *verbal and written* communications *are placed upon an equality* ; there is no distinction made between the written and the unwritten word, but the Thessalonians were to hold fast the traditions they had been taught, whether by *word* or by *epistle*. Observe also the words, “hold fast,” by which is implied, not that they would look into some future book of Scripture for them, but that they were to cling to them, to preserve them ; and this seems to me, at least, to imply the fact that they were to be handed down by tradition, and not to be found afterwards in some parts of the inspired volume. Such was the interpretation which the most learned doctors of antiquity have given to this passage. St. Basil, in his book on the Holy Ghost, cap. 29, writes thus :

“According to my sentiment, it is Apostolical to persevere in *unwritten traditions*, for the Apostle has said, ‘Brethren, stand fast,’” &c.



This was written in the 4th century. The great St. Chrysostom says on this place :

“ Hence it is evident, that the *Apostles have not delivered all things by Epistles, but many also without writing. But one and the other are equally deserving of belief.*”

Theophylactus and Œcumenius express themselves in similar language.

I could cite others to the same effect, but this is sufficient to shew you that belief in tradition, and my exposition of the preceding text, were admitted by the early fathers, as well as by the Catholics of the present day.

I shall be told, perhaps, that the traditions have been since lost. This was the answer given by Whitby, a celebrated Protestant commentator, and also by a champion of the Reformation Society, Mr. Gordon. But *what proof have you* that they were afterwards lost? What proof have you that the Apostles would be so neglectful of the traditions of Christ as to suffer them to be lost? I have in part answered the difficulty already; I will confirm that answer by the authority of a *Protestant writer*, whom I quote from a book of sufficient authority to ensure the correctness of the extract. “ England’s Conversion and Reformation.” In p. 43, I find this quotation from the work of a Protestant writer, entitled “ Tradition Necessary,” p. 32, 33.

“ Here we see plain mention of St. Paul’s traditions, consequently of *Apostolical Traditions, delivered by word of mouth*, as well as by Epistles or in writing; and a condemnation of those who do not equally observe both.”—“ Thus,” he continues in page 78, “ it is evident *from the Scriptures themselves*, that the whole of Christianity, was at first delivered to the Bishops succeeding the Apostles by *oral Tradition*; and they were also commanded to keep and *deliver it to their successors in the same manner*. Nor is it any where found in Scripture by St. Paul, or any other of the Apostles, *that they would either jointly or separately write down all that they had taught as necessary to Salvation, or that they would make such a complete canon of them, that nothing should be necessary to Salvation, but what should be found in those writings.*”

I return to my quotations from Scripture, proving the existence of tradition, 2 Thess. iii. 6. “ Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother who walketh disorderly, and not after *the tradition* which he received from us.” In 1 Tim. vi. 20, “ O, Timothy, keep that *which is committed to thy trust*, avoiding profane and vain babblings and oppositions of science falsely so called.” In the 2 Tim. i. 13, “ Hold fast the form of sound words, which *thou hast heard of me* in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus.” Let me conclude this day by quoting to you, on this subject, the opinion of a Protestant, Lord Somers, in his Tracts, p. 341, vol. iii.

“ As I am not of those who admire the great knowledge in divine matters revealed in this latter age of the world, I do not think there are any now so likely to discover the truth of Gospel mysteries *as those of ancient days*. As for that saying, a pigmy set on a giant's shoulder may see more than a giant; pardon me if I call it a shallow and a silly fancy, nothing to our purpose; for our question is not of seeing more, but of the clear discerning and judging those things we all see, but are in doubt what they mean; if a pigmy and a giant see a beast at a mile distant, and are in dispute whether it be a horse or an ox, the pigmy set on the giant's shoulder, is never the nearer discerning what it is, which depends on the sharpness of sight, not on the height of his shoulders: Now that the ancient and holy Fathers of the Church *were more spiritual and consequently sharper-sighted* in spiritual things than we carnal creatures of this latter age, is evident by their spiritual holy lives. . . . Wherefore I *shall always hearken with due reverence unto what those primitive holy Fathers deliver*, and the more holy and more ancient doubtless more to be regarded.”

---

SECOND DAY.—*Thursday, Feb. 27, 1834.*

---

SUBJECT:

THE RULE OF FAITH (*continued.*)

THE CHAIRMAN.—I have the honour to inform you, that the discussion will be resumed—the subject, The Rule of Faith.

THE REV. E. TOTTENHAM.

Mr. Chairman, my Reverend opponent yesterday seemed to complain that I should have touched upon the Apocryphal question, because (as he says) it was mutually agreed that the Protestant Rule of Faith, and not the Roman Catholic, should be discussed between us. Now, Sir, though I am aware that, during these first three days of the discussion, Mr. Brown appears rather in the attitude of an assailant than a defendant, yet I do not consider that the arrangement was so precise as to preclude me altogether from a notice of the Roman Catholic rule. You will remember, Sir, that when at the opening of the meeting, the rules were read which had been agreed upon by both parties, the way in which the subject was specified, was, THE RULE OF FAITH—*generally*—without any limitation. And let me add, that the title to the subject was given by Mr.

Brown himself; for, when I asked him in my private interview how we should express the subject, he said, “The Rule of Faith.”

I have another observation to make in reference to this point. Mr. Brown frequently during the discussion *violated his own principles*, because he constantly adduced texts of Scripture in support of tradition and the authority of the Church. There he was maintaining his *own* rule of faith, and not merely attacking *mine*: and, therefore, upon this principle of violation on his part, I am equally justified in attacking his rule of faith as in defending my own. So far for this matter.

The observations just made will appear more striking from what is to follow: for I am going to consider two or three texts of Scripture, which Mr. Brown has adduced in support of tradition, or an additional rule of faith besides the written word of God. The first text I shall notice is that quoted from the 11th chapter of 1st Corinthians, 34th verse, where the Apostle says at the close of the chapter—

“And the rest I will set in order when I come.”

From this Mr. Brown draws an argument in favour of tradition, or in defence of the assertion that all things which we require are not contained in the written word. Now I have *two answers* to give to this passage, or rather to this application of the passage:—

1st. A general conclusion respecting tradition cannot fairly be deduced from this text, because the circumstances to which the Apostle here alludes were more probably *peculiar to the Corinthian Church*, than of general application. This will appear, first of all, if you look to the 1st chap. and the 11th verse, where we read that the Apostle *had received intimation concerning some peculiar circumstances* in the Corinthian Church; and in reference to those peculiar circumstances, though not altogether, he wrote the epistle—“For (says he) it hath been signified unto me, my brethren, of you by them that are of the house of Chloe, that there are contentions amongst you.” Then, if we pass to the 7th chap. 1st verse, we find that the Corinthians, or some amongst them, *had written for information upon particular points*; for the Apostle begins by saying, “Now, concerning the things *whereof you wrote to me*,” &c. Further, the *connexion* of the passage seems to lead us to the supposition that the Apostle was speaking in this place of matters peculiar to the Corin-

thian Church, and not of general application. In the preceding part of the chapter he had dilated with reference to the Lord's Supper; and had noticed an error which *certainly was peculiar* to the Corinthian Church. Pursuing these observations, he comes to the close of the chapter, and then says "*The rest* will I set in order when I come." These circumstances give very strong colour to the supposition I have advanced with respect to this passage. But—

2ndly. I have another answer (and this answer will serve for *all* the texts)—Let the Church of Rome *produce* the tradition or traditions of which the Apostle here speaks—let her authenticate them before the world as being the very same to which he refers—and then shall we receive them; but until that is done we have no right to do so.

Another passage to which Mr. Brown referred will be found in the 20th chapter of St. John, and the 30th verse,—

"Many *other* signs also did Jesus in the sight of his disciples, which are *not written* in this book."

Here, you will observe, Mr. Brown argues that Christ must have done and spoken many things not recorded in this Gospel, or in the Scriptures generally. I am not going to dispute this. It is a fact I am willing to admit, because the Apostle here states it; and I have no desire to question the statement of the Apostle. But then Mr. Brown, or our friends on the other side, must prove that those things which Christ thus spoke were *absolutely necessary to salvation*. Now it would appear to me that the remaining verse of the chapter seems to prove that they were *not* necessary to salvation, or that, if they were, that which was necessary in them *was already embodied* in what the Apostle had stated; for he goes on to say,—

"But these are written *that you may believe* that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God: and that, believing, you may *have life in his name*."—v. 31.

This is one of the passages to which I referred at the opening of the discussion, and it seems, or more than seems, to imply, that the Apostle John had written within the compass of his Gospel all the truths which were *absolutely necessary* to be believed for salvation; so that, if there were no other book in the Bible, we should find the truth in that Gospel.

But here again we come to the *other* answer—let the Church of Rome *produce* these sayings, and authenticate

them as the very words of Christ, and then we shall receive them.

The 12th verse of St. John's 2nd Epistle has also been quoted :—

“ Having more things to write unto you, I would not by paper and ink ; for I hope that I shall be with you, and speak face to face, that your joy may be full.”

In reply to Mr. Brown's application of this passage, I say,

1st. That a Roman Catholic, before he can make use of it to his purpose, is bound to prove that the things of which the Apostle speaks were *essential to salvation*. If he does not prove that, he proves nothing to the purpose ; for, if the things to which the Apostle refers were *not* essential to be believed in order to be saved, then the objection drawn from this passage does not at all militate against the sufficiency of the written word as a rule of *faith*.

2ndly. I remark, that the things of which the Apostle here speaks were either of particular or of general application. If they were of *particular* application, they referred only to individuals, namely, the “ elect lady and her children,” to whom the epistle was addressed. In this case it is quite evident that Mr. Brown's argument from the text is invalid. But if the things were of *general* application, then let Mr. Brown remember *his own statement* during the discussion yesterday, namely, that *the Gospel of St. John and the Revelations were written after this epistle*. This being the case, it is but reasonable to suppose that if the Apostle referred in this passage to things of *general* application, but which he could not then notice, we should find them in those *other* portions of sacred writ which he delivered to the world before his death. For I maintain this fact, and can produce Scripture to prove it (and shall, perhaps, before I sit down) that the apostles *did write the same truths which they orally delivered*.

3rdly. We come to the same answer that I gave to the other texts—let the Church of Rome *produce* those things—let her prove that *her* traditions are what the apostle here refers to—and then, but not till then, shall we receive them.

A reference was again made by my Rev. opponent to the prophecy of Enoch, which is found recorded in the Epistle of Jude ; and he asked, *how could this prophecy have been*

*preserved except by tradition?* I think we may give a very easy answer to that question. Mr. Brown, in making this remark, seems to forget that the Epistle of Jude *was the result of inspiration*; and therefore though the knowledge of this prophecy might have been wholly lost from the world, are we not to suppose that the Spirit of God, acting upon the mind of the Apostle when he wrote this Epistle, would have brought it before him as a real fact and as a truth? To say the contrary is to limit the extent of Divine inspiration.

In this place Mr. Brown anticipated an objection. He said, “Perhaps I may be asked, how are the traditions of which I have been speaking *preserved?*” and then he replied by asking another question,—“How were the traditions preserved *before the time of Moses?*” To this question I shall endeavour to give an answer, and to shew that *the two cases are not at all parallel.*

1st. I answer, it is reasonable to suppose that oral tradition might have been much more easily preserved at *that* period of the world than at the *present*, in consequence of the *long lives* which the patriarchs of old were permitted to enjoy. Take, for example, Adam and Methuselah. *These two lives alone occupied nearly 2000 years*: so that here we see how a tradition had to pass only from one man to another, and there was no great danger therefore (we might suppose) of tradition being corrupted; certainly nothing like the danger that has existed since the life of man has been reduced to such a small compass as it is at present and has been for ages.

2ndly. Another thing to be considered in this matter is, that at the time to which Mr. Brown refers, and in which he says traditions were so perfectly preserved, there was an especial guardianship on the part of God, he having during that time made especial and visible communications of himself to the patriarchs of old, as we read in the Old Testament. And until Mr. Brown can prove that there is as direct and special communication from God *now*, as there was in the Antediluvian ages, and before the time of Moses, I contend the cases are not parallel. However,—

3rdly. I think the reference is rather unfortunate, and that it proves more against the other side of the question than for it. For what was the moral condition of the world under such circumstances? For the greater part of the time at least, if not the whole, ungodliness and im-

piety prevailed to an awful extent. We read in the Book of Genesis that “ *all flesh had corrupted its way*” over the earth, and that the iniquity of man had become so great that God was obliged to bring a flood of waters to destroy all (save eight souls) from the face of the globe. Very similar accounts are also given of the state of things *after* the deluge, and therefore we see in these simple facts sufficient proof of the uncertainty and danger of following mere tradition. The parallel, then, I contend on these grounds, does not hold good.

Mr. Brown referred to some celebrated Protestant commentator, who asserted that the doctrines of the resurrection and of the immortality of the soul could not be proved from the Old Testament. Now, in the first place, I say it does not follow that, because this Protestant writer *said* so, therefore his statement is *true*. We are not always to take the word of an individual upon a question. Mr. Brown would not do it on his side, and therefore he has no right to make me do it upon mine. And the more particularly in this case, when we have the testimony of our Lord himself that these points *can* be proved from the Old Testament. In Matthew xxii. (to which I before referred) we read that the Sadducees had fallen into error in denying the resurrection. Our Lord told them that they erred *because they did not know the Scriptures*; and then he proves the doctrine in question *out of the Scriptures*; he refers to a chapter in Exodus, to which I called your attention at the time I was commenting on this passage.

My Rev. opponent has again said that my argument drawn from the divisions in the primitive Church as proving as much against their rule of faith, as the divisions among Protestants did against ours, was not valid. He maintained in his last speech that Protestants *did* differ on *essential* matters of faith; and then he enumerated Methodists, Calvinists, Unitarians, and so forth. Allow me, Sir, to protest most decidedly against the introduction of Unitarians into this list. I do not acknowledge simple Unitarians to be properly classed among those who are orthodox Protestants. They are Protestants, it is true, for they protest against the Church of Rome. They are Protestants, in the same sense in which *every* man, who is not a member of the Church of Rome, is a Protestant; but *scriptural* Protestants they are not. A simple Unitarian has neither part nor lot in the matter; for Protes-



tantism is founded upon the essential and necessary doctrine of CHRIST'S SUPREME DEITY; and if that be removed there is no Protestantism, yea, there is no Christianity. I maintain my original position, that Protestants do not differ on essential matters of faith.

Mr. Brown noticed differences on the subject of Grace; but let me remind him that I told him of differences yesterday in his own Church, which has so loudly boasted of its unity. I produced, among others, the instance of Soto and Vega, differing on this very subject of grace, and each taking an opposite view of the decisions of the Council of Trent with respect to it.

To prove that every thing is not contained in Scripture which we require, Mr. Brown called our attention to the opening of the Acts of the Apostles, the 1st chapter, and the 3rd verse:—

“ To whom, also, (says St. Luke,) he (i. e. Christ) shewed himself alive after his passion, by many proofs, for forty days appearing to them, and *speaking of the kingdom of God.*”

In advancing this passage, however, in proof of what he has asserted, my Rev. opponent seems to have overlooked the fact that the canon of the New Testament was not at this time completed, indeed, not even commenced at the period of these conversations. But I contend that every thing requisite and essential that Christ spoke to his disciples during those forty days, *they afterwards committed to writing.* I quoted a passage yesterday from the close of the Gospel of St. Luke, where we are told what were the subjects upon which our Lord spoke with them after his resurrection. In the 24th chapter of St. Luke, the 26th and 27th verses, we read thus:—

“ Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and so to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses and all the Prophets, he expounded to them in all the Scriptures the things that were *concerning him.*”

And again in the 44th verse:—

“ He said unto them, *These are the words which I spoke to you while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me.*”

So that it was about his own character, offices, and work, that Christ spake to his disciples after his resurrection; and, let me ask, are not all these things dilated on in the Gospels and in the Epistles?

One instance of the violation of that principle, upon which Mr. Brown set out, occurred at this part of the subject; where he talked of the Catholic Church being



secure in the promises of Christ, and referred to passages in Matthew, John, and one of the Epistles to Timothy, as proving that Christ will be with his Church, and that that Church was to be the “pillar and ground of the truth.” Now the Rev. gentleman *was here attempting to prove the infallibility of his own Church, and not simply attacking the Protestant rule of faith.* There was an instance of the very violation with which he charged me. However, I am just as much disposed as Mr. Brown to admit that the Catholic Church is safe in the promises of Christ—that “the gates of hell shall never prevail against it;” but there is an important point in the controversy to settle here, namely, *Is the Church of Rome the Catholic Church?* Until that be settled, and settled decisively, we want a very essential link in the chain. I do not dispute the *promise*, but the application of it to the Church of which Mr. Brown is a member.

Much has been said about the means by which a poor man could discover tradition; and, in order to get out of this difficulty, my antagonist asserts that the poor man has the *authority of the Church* to guide him. Well, but in reply I say, *how* does the Church point out the traditions, and assure him that they are divine or apostolical? The poor man must believe upon the word of the individual priest—he must take the matter *on trust*—he cannot assure himself of it—and therefore he has no more *certainty* than the Protestant, nor half so much.

There is another difficulty, too, which meets him here. *How is the poor man to find out the Church?* Mr. Brown says, in the first instance, he must find it out *by exercising his private judgment*: if, therefore, he is to discover the most important point of all by private judgment, why not discover *other* points as well as this? But, in fact, according to Roman Catholic principles, the man has no *certainty* in the matter, because, if he has nothing but his private judgment to guide him in the discovery of the true Church, and if the Roman Catholic principle regarding private judgment be valid, *he cannot be sure of the meaning of those texts of Scripture which are said to prove the infallibility of the Church.* Dr. Milner admits that an individual must prove the application of the *marks* of the Church to the Church of Rome, or to any Church that professes to be the Church of Christ, before he can prove that that Church is the Church of Christ. Now there are four marks generally mentioned:—Unity, sanctity,

catholicity, and apostolicity: *all these marks involve the consideration of doctrine.* The doctrine must be *true*, in order to be *holy*, and in order to be the *one* doctrine that Christ revealed. It must be *true* doctrine to be *Catholic*, and to be *Apostolic*, doctrine. So what is the poor man to do? *He must examine the doctrines that any Church proposes to him, before he can be sure that that Church is the Church of Christ.* Either, therefore, he can, by the exercise of his judgment, find out in this examination of doctrine that the Church of Rome is the true Church, or he cannot. If he *cannot*, then he has no *certainty* as to that which constitutes his practical rule of faith. If he *can*, then he discovers his rule of faith, *just at the time he does not want it*, because he has been *previously* obliged to investigate every one of the essential doctrines, these being *involved* in the *marks* by which the Church is proved.

Mr. Brown says he did not contend for the infallibility of the Fathers, and he considers it very hard that such a calumny as this should be uttered against a Roman Catholic. I did not say, nor do I want to say, that Mr. Brown contends *literally* for the infallibility of the Fathers, but what I say is, that on his principles, to be consistent, he *ought* to do so. I pressed this point yesterday, because it involves a difficulty which he has not yet got over, and which it will be hard for him to remove. Mr Brown told us (as I quoted from his pamphlet) that some traditions were “preserved in the writings of the Fathers.” Then, I ask, *how are those traditions to be distinguished without admitting the infallibility of the writings generally?* On this ground, therefore, while we would not charge Roman Catholics with holding the infallibility of the Fathers professedly, yet we say that, *to be consistent*, they *ought* to do so.

My opponent says he only believes a moral unanimous consent existing among the Fathers. I contend there is no unanimous consent of any kind to be found in them, as regards the interpretation of Scripture. Let me, for example, notice two points, which are most important to a Roman Catholic:—the supremacy of St. Peter, and the doctrine of purgatory. I shall not, of course, investigate them now, but I am going to shew that the Fathers exhibit no moral unanimous consent with regard to the interpretation of the passages of Scripture which are said to prove these doctrines. I have before me an extract from CARDINAL BEL-  
LARMINE, giving the different interpretations of the Fathers upon the passage in the 1st Corinthians, 3rd chapter,

12th and following verses :—“ Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones; wood, hay, stubble,” &c. This is one of the texts adduced in support of the doctrine of Purgatory. I may observe, in passing, that Bellarmine makes an observation just before he comes to the extract that I am about to read, which would seem to imply that he did not think the obscurity of Scripture was any argument against its utility.

“ Mark, in the first place (he observes), this is one of the *most difficult* and *most useful* passages of Scripture.”

You see that he couples the difficulty with the utility of the Scriptures. But to come to his Commentary at large on the passage. He says :—

“ The difficulties of this passage are five in number. 1. What is understood by the builders. 2. What is understood by gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, and stubble. 3. What is understood by the day of the Lord. 4. What is understood by the fire, which in the day of the Lord shall prove every man's work. 5. What is understood by the fire, of which it is said, he shall be saved, yet so as by fire. When these things are explained, the passage will be clear.

“ The first difficulty, therefore, is, who are the architects that build upon the foundation. Augustine, in his book on faith and works, ch. 16, and elsewhere, thinks that all Christians are here called by the Apostle architects, and that all build upon the foundation of faith either good or bad works. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, and Œcumenius, appear to me to teach the same on this passage. Very many others teach that only the doctors and preachers of the Gospel are here called architects by the Apostle. So Ambrose and Sedulius on this place. Jerome insinuates this in his 2nd book against Jovinianus. The blessed Anselm and the blessed Thomas hold the same opinion on this passage, although they do not reject the former opinion. Many of the more modern think the same, as Dionysius the Carthusian, Lyra, Cajetan, and others - - - - -

“ The second difficulty is rather more serious; for there are six opinions. Some by the name of foundation understand a true, but an ill-digested faith. By the names of gold, silver, and precious stones, good works: by the names of wood, hay, and stubble, mortal sins. Thus Chrysostom upon this place, who is followed by Theophylact.—The second opinion is, that Christ, or the preaching of the faith, is understood by the name of foundation: that, by the name of gold, silver, and precious stones, are understood Catholic expositions: by the name of wood, hay, and stubble, are understood heretical doctrines, as the Commentary of Ambrose, and also Jerome, seems to teach. The third opinion, by the name of foundation understands living faith; by the name of gold, silver, precious stones, understands works of supererogation; by the name of wood, hay, stubble, the neglect of advice, and a certain carnal inclination to the good things of this life, &c. Thus the blessed Augustine, in his book on faith and works. - - - - - The fourth opinion is that which is held by those who explain by gold, silver, &c. good works; by hay, stubble, &c. venial sins. Thus the blessed Gregory, in the 4th book of his Dialogues, chap. 39, and others. The fifth is of those who understand by gold, silver, &c. good hearers; by stubble, bad hearers, &c. Thus Theodoret and Œcumenius. The sixth opinion, which we prefer to all, is, that by the name of foundation is to be understood Christ, as preached by the first preachers. By the name of gold, silver, &c. is to be understood, the useful and salutary doctrine of other preachers, who teach those that have already received the

faith, and teach not only by word, but by example, &c. By the name of wood, hay, &c. is to be understood the doctrine, not indeed heretical or bad, but yet the singular, useless, &c. doctrine of those preachers, who preach catholically to the Catholic people, but without that fruit and profit which God requires.

“ The third difficulty regards the day of the Lord. Some understand by the name of day, the present life, or the time of tribulation. Thus Augustine, in his book on faith and works, c. 16; and Gregory, in the 4th book of his Dialogues, c. 39. - - - - But all the ancients seem to have understood by that day, the day of the last judgment, as Theodoret, Theophylact, Anselm, and others.

“ The fourth difficulty is, what is the fire which, in the day of the Lord, shall prove every one's work? Some understand the tribulation of this life, as Augustine and Gregory, in the places noted, but this we have already rejected. Some understand eternal fire, but that cannot be, for that fire shall not try the building of gold and silver. - - - - Others understand by it the pains of Purgatory, but neither can that be correctly said. First, because the fire of purgatory does not prove the works of those who build gold and silver: but that fire of which we speak shall prove every one's work of what sort it is. Secondly, the Apostle clearly makes a distinction between the works and the workmen, and says concerning that fire, that it shall burn the works, but not the workers: for he says, if any one's work shall remain, and if any one's work shall burn, &c.—but the fire of purgatory, which is a true and real fire, cannot burn works, which are transitory actions, and have already passed. Lastly, it would follow, that all men, even the most holy, would pass through the fire of purgatory, and be saved by fire, for all are to pass through the fire of which we are speaking. But that all are to pass through the fire of purgatory, and to be saved by fire, is clearly false: for the Apostle here openly says, that only those who build wood and hay are to be saved as by fire: the Church also has always been of opinion that holy martyrs, and infants dying after baptism, are presently received into heaven without any passage through fire, as the Council of Florence teaches in its last session. It remains therefore that we should say, that the Apostle here speaks of the fire of the severe and just judgment of God, which is not a purging or punishing fire, but one that probes and examines. Thus Ambrose explains it on Psal. cxviii. Also Sedulius.

“ The fifth and last difficulty is—what is understood by the fire, when he says, he shall be saved, yet so as by fire. Some understand the tribulations of this life; but this cannot properly be said, because then even he who built gold and silver would be saved as by fire. Wherefore Augustine and Gregory, who are the authors of this opinion, when they were not satisfied with it, proposed another, of which we shall speak presently. Some understand it to be eternal fire, as Chrysostom and Theophylact, but this we have already refuted. Others understand the fire of the conflagration of the world. It is therefore the common opinion of theologians, that by the name of fire in this place is understood some purgatorial and temporal punishment, to which after death they are adjudged, who are found in their particular trial to have built wood, hay, or stubble.”—Bell. tom. ii. ch. 5. de Purg. lib. 1.

This is rather a long and tedious passage, but I have adduced it at length, in order to shew that on one of the chief texts, upon which an article of faith is built in the Church of Rome, there are all these differences of opinion amongst the Fathers; and that, upon Bellarmine's testimony. Shall we talk of what Mr. Brown calls a “moral unanimous consent” amongst them, after this exhibition? I might have given other quotations, as I before intimated,

respecting the supremacy of Peter, but as my time is passing on, I shall not dwell upon this at present.

A quotation was introduced from some anonymous Protestant, and it was said, that the name of the author of the book in which the quotation occurred was a sufficient security for its correctness. This may be a sufficient security for Mr. Brown, but it certainly will not be for me, and for many others. At all events, the matter is of no consequence. The testimony of this *anonymous* Protestant has, I am sure, precisely the same weight with this meeting, as *an anonymous letter which was sent to me, to frighten me from this discussion*, had with me.

The Rev. T. J. BROWN.—The author's name was Brett.

The Rev. E. TOTTENHAM resumed.—Mr. Brown then proceeded to remark, that Scripture speaks of tradition, and he has referred to the 2nd Epistle to the Thessalonians, 2nd chap. 14th verse, and other passages. I may observe here, by the way, that, whether I satisfy Mr. Brown, and our friends present, or not, in my interpretation of the texts he has adduced, I am, at all events, giving them a fair examination; whereas, Mr. Brown professes to give only a sweeping answer to all the texts which I quoted yesterday, instead of coming to a particular investigation of them.

Now, in the 2nd Thessalonians, 2nd chap. 14th verse—the great passage upon which the authority of tradition has been founded by our Roman Catholic adversaries—it is said:—

“Therefore, brethren, stand fast; and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word, or by our Epistle.”

On this passage I observe—1st. That the mere use of the *word* tradition, either here or elsewhere, proves nothing, because tradition may be what is *written*, as well as what is *spoken*. But then the passage says, “Whether *by word* or by our Epistle:” and Mr. Brown hence argues, that verbal and written traditions are placed here on an equal footing of authority. This leads me to remark—

2ndly, That if they be *divine*, I admit at once oral and written statements to be of equal authority: and, on this principle, I hold the writings of the Apostles and their oral teaching to be equally binding, because both were the result of Divine inspiration. If, therefore, the Church of Rome can prove *her* “unwritten traditions” to be *of divine origin*, we shall admit them, as I have said fre-

quently; but, until that be proved, we must reject them. In the further investigation of this passage, I say—

3rdly, It does not appear to be a *general* assertion with regard to tradition that the Apostle is here making, but he seems to be specifying *some particular traditions* which, I contend, were *written in this Epistle*, as well as *previously spoken*. The Apostle means (according to the interpretation I would put upon the passage) this—"Therefore, my brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which you have learned, *whether by my oral teaching, in the first instance, while I was with you, or now by my written Epistle which I send to you.*" And in support of this interpretation, let us bear in mind one or two particulars. Observe, first of all, that the Apostle *had been at Thessalonica* previous to this, as we read in the 17th chap. of the Acts. Then, secondly, if you look at the 5th and following verses of this chapter, they would seem to lead to the conclusion that the explanation I have given is correct: and it is by the *context* that we are to find out the real meaning of texts of Scripture.

"Remember you not," says the Apostle, "that, *while I was yet with you, I told you these things?* (*i. e.* respecting the revelation of the 'man of sin,' &c.) And now you know what withholdeth, that he may be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity already worketh: only that he who now holdeth, do hold, until he be taken out of the way. And *then that wicked one shall be revealed*, whom the Lord Jesus shall kill with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming: him, whose coming is after the power of Satan, in all power and signs, and lying wonders," &c. &c.

And then—after continuing this subject, and dwelling, by way of contrast, upon the blessed condition of those to whom he wrote—he comes in the 14th verse to draw the conclusion, and give the exhortation:—

"Therefore, brethren (seeing all this is so), stand fast: and hold the traditions (respecting these matters) which you have learned, whether by word (when, being with you, *I told you these things*), or by our Epistle (now that I have *written* them.)"

The traditions, therefore, here spoken of, were traditions *relative to the revelation of the Wicked One*, of whom the Apostle speaks in the context; and he himself tells us in the 5th verse, *that he had told them* of these things at the time of his visit to them. The fact is thus established, upon the Apostle's own testimony, that he *wrote* what he had previously *preached orally*, and that is what I am contending for during the whole of this discussion. But,

4thly, We reply again, as we did to the other passages. The Roman Catholics contend for the divine authority of



their traditions. Let them prove to us that their traditions are the identical traditions of which the Apostle here speaks, and then we shall have no hesitation in receiving them; but it is quite absurd to argue that traditions are spoken of in Scripture, and forthwith, by a tremendous leap, to arrive at the conclusion that the traditions of the Church of Rome *are* those traditions.

Another passage was adduced from the 2nd Epistle to the Thessalonians, 3rd chapter, 6th verse:—

“We charge you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you withdraw yourselves from every brother walking disorderly, and not according to the tradition which they have received of us.”

In reference to this passage—I say—

1st, As in the case of the text just considered, the mere use of the *word* tradition here proves nothing: and, considering that the Apostle had written another Epistle to the Thessalonians *before this*, I should like to know why I have not just as much right to conclude that he here alluded to instructions which he had delivered *in his first Epistle*, as Mr. Brown has to conclude that they were mere oral instructions. But—

2ndly, It is a remarkable fact, that Chrysostom, Theodoret, Œcumenius, and others of the Fathers, say that the tradition here alluded to by the Apostle, was one which he delivered *by his works*, in which he gave them *an example of industry*. And this appears very probable from what immediately follows, where he says:—

“For you yourselves know how *you ought to imitate us*: for *we were not disorderly* among you: neither did we eat any man’s bread for nothing, but in labour and in toil *we worked night and day*, lest we should be chargeable to any of you. Not as if we had not power: but *that we might give ourselves a pattern unto you, to imitate us*. For also, when we were with you, *this we declared unto you*; that, *if any man will not work, neither let him eat*. For we have heard that there are some among you who *walk disorderly, working not at all*, but curiously meddling,” &c.

These two answers will suffice for this passage.

The 2nd Epistle to Timothy, 1st chap. 13th verse, was then cited:—

“Hold the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith, and in the love which is in Christ Jesus.”

I cannot see how an argument can fairly be drawn from this in support of tradition, especially when we recollect that the Apostle had written a previous Epistle to Timothy. This passage occurs in the *second* Epistle, and I say, therefore (as in the case of the other passage), I have as much right to conclude that the allusion of the Apostle here is *to his first Epistle*, as Mr. Brown has to refer it to oral



teaching. However, as we said on the other passages, let the form of sound words be *produced* and *authenticated*, and *then* we shall receive it.

Whether I have given a correct interpretation of these passages or not, I have at least come to their investigation; while Mr. Brown, on the contrary, has *not* come to the investigation of the passages in defence of the Protestant Rule of Faith which I adduced yesterday: at least he has noticed only two or three of them.

---

THE REV. T. M. MACDONNELL.

WHEN I came into this part of the country I was not aware that my Rev. friend would ask me to take a part in this discussion; however, I willingly acceded to the request made by him, and if I advert to the topic of which I have spoken, it is because I consider it a duty every man owes to the sacred cause which is before you, that he who engages in it should endeavour to be as well prepared to do justice to it as possible.

In taking part in this important discussion, I beg leave to add my exhortations to those which you have before heard, that every thing in the shape of prejudice, or of preconceived impressions, should be as much as possible removed from your minds. I trust that the Rev. gentlemen on the other side are impressed with that great truth, which is seated deeply in our minds and hearts, that we shall be answerable for the doctrines we deliver to the people of God; and that, in a very short time, when we descend into the grave, it will be a matter of no consequence whether we have excited the approbation or the censure of others; but it will be a matter of very great consequence whether we shall have been in the hands of our ever beneficent and good God, humble instruments in promoting his truth, and doing good to the souls of our brethren. It is with these principles strongly impressed on my mind that I rise to address this respectable audience; and I repeat my earnest request, that they will for a moment disengage themselves from every party feeling—that they will consider it possible that truth may be *on one side*, and that it may be, by possibility, *on the other*. If, Sir, they give me their patient attention, and endeavour

to divest themselves so far of their preconceived opinions, I humbly trust that those principles that appear to me clear and irresistible, may make some impression on their minds.

Most willingly do I give credit to the Rev. gentleman on the opposite side for great talent, great command of language, great skill in the selection of his arguments, and address in replying to those of his opponent; but, I bring this as a charge against him, because, notwithstanding these advantages, he continually slips away, whenever he has the opportunity, from that subject which solely and entirely he is bound to consider at present, in order that he may assail the principles of his Catholic brethren. This has uniformly been the case. This accounts for the satisfaction with which he plunged into the Apocrypha yesterday; and this explains the nature of his intimacy with the Fathers—an intimacy just contracted, as he tells us, with a view to destroy their authority, and to prove that they are of no value.

What is the question after all? Mr. Tottenham cannot deny that he has chosen his subject for discussion in the following week, simply and solely that he may attack the Catholic Church; he cannot deny that the subject he has selected, the holy sacrifice of the Mass, has been selected in order that he may have the exclusive privilege of assailing the Catholic Church. Is it not quite clear, therefore, that, in the spirit of impartiality and justice, he should undertake, during these three days, to prove his own principles instead of assailing ours? This, Sir, he has not done.

I shall not follow Mr. Tottenham through the several texts of the Sacred Scripture which he has produced, but I will request his attention, and respectfully invite that of this assembly, to certain points, reflection upon which will, I think, clearly prove that for the great mass of Christians the Scriptures require explanation; and if the Scriptures do require explanation, something besides the mere letter of Scripture is requisite to enable the inquirer to know the revealed will of God.

Now, what is it upon which we are arguing? It is, whether the Scripture alone be the rule of faith; whether it be the only rule of faith which Christ has given to mankind; and we want to know, of all the different doctrines of Christian Churches, which are the true doctrines of Jesus Christ. The gentleman on the other side holds

certain doctrines, what they are he has not told us; *we* teach different doctrines; probably certain other Rev. gentlemen present teach doctrines different from us both; and again, there are certain other Rev. gentlemen not present who teach doctrines different from all three; yet we all claim to belong to the Christian Church. Now these contradictory doctrines cannot proceed from the God of truth; for if, for instance, God has taught the Unitarian to know that the ever blessed Saviour *was no more than man*, he has not taught *me* that *he is God*. With regard, in like manner, to any other point, if he has taught one side, he most clearly has not taught the other; this is clear to the commonest understanding. Let us suppose, then, they are the doctrines of Christianity upon which we desire to determine. Now, who is it that has a right to give us a rule for that purpose? Clearly the Divine Author of Christianity, our blessed Redeemer, Jesus Christ. It is he alone that can give us this rule. Is there, then, any part of *our blessed Redeemer's teaching* in which *this* is clearly laid down, that the Bible, and the Bible alone, is to be the rule by the application of which his disciples should find out the true religion? I am sure the gentleman on the other side will not venture to say that our Saviour's language came in any respect near to this principle; but, if Christ has not taught us, I beg leave to say, I do not mean to receive it from the gentlemen of the Reformation Society. If Christ has taught it, they will tell us where it is taught; they will let us hear it in such clear language as will convince every one who is disposed to be convinced. *Our Saviour* gave instructions to his apostles; he told them what to do in order to convert the world, but *HE* never told them to go and *write*; so that in regard to the inspiration of which the Rev. gentleman spoke, I should be glad to know how the poor man is able to prove that inspiration. He tells us that inspiration here amounts to a command. Inspiration, however, amounts only to this—that a person teaching according to the promises of Almighty God, and under the influence of the sacred Spirit, whether he teaches by word of mouth, as St. Paul saith, or by epistle, he is equally under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

Now, having stated that there is no part of Scripture in which our blessed Saviour delivers this rule, and having repudiated the authority of the gentlemen of the Reformation Society, I come to another important point, namely,

that which in fact was laid down by my Rev. friend yesterday, that there are a vast number of people to whom this rule could not apply. What was the answer? That the objection is equally applicable to the rule laid down by the Catholic Church. But of what value is the answer of the Rev. gentleman? Good heavens! Does he always imagine that he has no other vocation in the world than to assail the members of the Catholic Church? That he is not to teach any doctrines upon their own merits, but to oppose and assail the principles only of Catholics? Suppose a poor man, who could not read, should come and ask him, "How am I to make out a religion from the Bible, for I cannot read it?" Would he say, "You cannot do much more if you go to the Catholics?" What would be the poor man's answer? "Sir, I do not mean to go to the Catholics; but I ask you as an expositor of the doctrines of Christianity, as one who goes about in the name of a Society in order to supply the deficiencies of the Established Church, as one who has superseded the bishops of that Church, as one who comes to reform an old reformation that seems to be worn out, I ask you of what use is the Bible to me, and the Bible alone, when I cannot read it after I have got it?" It follows that talking about the Catholic rule is entirely out of the question. Are immortal souls of so little value that they may be committed to the cast of a die? That a person must take his chance about a preference due to this party or that party? And if the minister will not lay down principles it is clear he cannot impress them upon the mind of the person who applies to him for instruction. Does he not suffer a person to come to him for the waters of life, and to go away without being refreshed? Nothing is clearer than that it is an absurdity to tell a person who cannot read, Here is the book for you; make out a religion from that book. This is the principle which the gentleman has enforced.

But there is another point: very many persons when they have read, cannot decide whether the reading is according to the original language in which the Scriptures were written. And when the gentleman presents the Bible, let it be remembered that he is delivering a translation of the Bible, and delivering a translation which no one thinks inspired, and which has no greater authority than an Act of Parliament. We have not yet found that a Church founded on an Act of Parliament is that of Christ and his Apostles. It is an acknowledged fact, that

Bibles have been given to the people of this country notoriously false, and notoriously corrupted, for a particular purpose; namely, to eradicate from the minds of the people their attachment to the faith which they had received from their ancestors, and which their ancestors received from the Catholic Church from the time of the Apostles. In order to eradicate that faith, it is notorious that the Bible was corrupted in a great number of places. That version of the Bible which at present has the sanction of an Act of Parliament and of the King, goes no higher than the time of James I. And why was that version given to the people of England? Avowedly in order to supply the deficiencies of the former Bible, which was acknowledged to be corrupt and falsified in essential points of doctrine, which Bible, nevertheless, had been given to the people as the word of God. How was the poor man to ascertain whether it was the word of God? How was he to know whether it was corrupted? How was he capable of applying to his own practical principles, as the guide of life, the doctrines which he should receive from a source that now is acknowledged to have been essentially corrupt, and corrupted for a bad purpose? Next we come to another important point.

But first I should state that heretofore, at Cheltenham, it was acknowledged by one who was the predecessor of the opposite gentleman, that the Bible could not be the rule to those who could not read, or could not purchase it. He said: "we do not maintain that it is a rule to those who cannot read it, or cannot get it, but we say it is a rule to those who can get it and can read it." This, Sir, is not the language of a lay substitute for the ministers of religion; this is the language of those who are to supersede the regular hierarchy, who go about, in the name of a vagrant Society, to supply the deficiencies of the local ministers of the Establishment. It is worthy of such persons. I read, however, in Scripture, that the poor man is, more than any other, the man to whom the Gospel of Christ was preached. The evangelizing of the poor was one of the great characteristics of our Saviour's mission; and yet the rule that alone, we are told, conducts to everlasting life, is a rule avowedly inaccessible to the poor man that cannot read, or whose means will not allow him to purchase the sacred volume. This is something so extraordinary, that I do not wonder that the Reverend Gentleman has recourse to observations such as these:—

“ I care not what this Protestant says or that ; I take the documents themselves ? ” But what is this Society which is to uproot the Catholic religion here as it sought to do in America ? this Society which is to destroy the Catholic Church, and to supply the deficiencies of the well-paid ministers of the Establishment ? is this Society to teach one thing to-day, and another to-morrow ? Is a person to say to-day : “ this is certainly not a rule for those who cannot read ; ” and then to say to-morrow : “ you have no other rule ? ” Will that satisfy the people of this country ? No ; it might have done some time ago, but they are become too enlightened to put up with a doctrine like this.

I come now to another point, that is, the divisions of which the Gentleman made so light. What is it we are endeavouring to arrive at ? A fact ; namely, which doctrine was revealed by Almighty God. It is certain that such a doctrine was taught by him, or not taught. The Gentleman has no right to say that he repudiates certain classes of Protestants. We do not ask Mr. Tottenham whom he chooses to enumerate in the list of Protestants ; we do not ask for his guidance and judgment, but we take the fact as it is avowed. The Unitarian is as much a Protestant as *he* is. He calls himself a Protestant, because he protests against the Catholic Church. By the way, this is an historical blunder. The name was not derived from protesting against the Catholic Church, but it was applied to those who protested against a particular act of a German power ; but it has been converted to this meaning by those who protested against the Catholic Church, or, as they call it, the Church of Rome. Well, is not an Unitarian sufficient master of the language to know whether it applies to him ? He protests against the Catholic Church just as much as that Gentleman does ; but his great error is, that he protests against that Gentleman also. The Unitarian protests against the Catholic Church as he does, and takes the same rule of faith as he does ; and who has given Mr. Tottenham a right to stand up and say that the Unitarian does not make use of the same rule as he does ? And if the Unitarian derives his doctrine from the sacred Scripture, *and from the Scripture alone*, and if it differs from the doctrine which Mr. Tottenham derives from the same sacred source, what right has Mr. Tottenham to say that the Unitarian is wrong and he is right ?

We know it is the practice of the Reformation Society

to say that the Unitarians are wrong, that they are not Protestants, that they are not Christians; and that the Unitarian, consequently, is not in the way of salvation: yet, by an extraordinary and unchristian inconsistency, they do not associate together to convert the Unitarians; and on the other hand, though they acknowledge we are in the way of salvation, though they acknowledge that Catholics may be saved, yet they associate together to give the Catholic a greater chance of salvation, and leave the poor Unitarian alone, whom they declare to be out of the way of salvation. Let us return, however, to the argument. If a person, whether Unitarian or not, takes up the sacred volume, and reads this passage of Scripture: "My Father is greater than I." When Mr. Tottenham preaches to him the divinity of Christ, he will say: "Yes, Sir, that is your language; but I go to the language of the Bible, and I am satisfied with that; the Bible says, 'My Father is greater than I.'" Mr. Tottenham says there are other passages; and no doubt he will establish the doctrine of the divinity of Christ thoroughly to my conviction; but how is he to establish it to the conviction of the poor man? The poor man says: "Sir, you tell me that I am to explain this passage by another, but I take the other passage and explain it by this; I prefer this to that. You tell me so and so; but your word is something in addition to the sacred Scripture; I want the sacred Scripture alone. Now, Sir, I make out that Christ is not God according to sacred Scripture. You make out that he is God according to the same rule. But can God have taught these two opposite doctrines? No! it is quite clear that he could not, because they do not agree: one is therefore false, and God, who is unerring truth, could not teach falsehood." Again, I ask Mr. Tottenham how he can get over this difficulty; for if a poor man comes to him, and asks by what rule he is to find out the truth, Mr. Tottenham is bound to say: "Take the Scriptures; you must make it out from the Scriptures." He has no right to say any thing else; he has no right to give him instructions, to give him any assistance, because that is not Scripture. He must give him the volume, and let him make out the meaning of that volume in the best way he can, and unassisted.

Mr. Tottenham denied that private judgment was a part of the rule of faith. He said that it was not a part of the



rule of faith, but the application of the rule. But what is the Scripture? not the mere words, not the mere letters (as a Protestant writer has very properly observed), of which it is composed; but it is *the sense of the Scripture*. Now several persons will have the same text, but they will differ upon its meaning; it is therefore the sense of the text which alone is useful in order to establish the several doctrines which people believe; and Mr. Tottenham has nothing else but the private judgment of each person for that purpose. He felt this; for although my Reverend friend felt restricted from directing his arguments against private judgment, Mr. Tottenham thought it necessary to vindicate private judgment, and he made some ingenious observations for that purpose.

I must now refer to some points in reference to the sacred Scriptures. Where is it stated that our blessed Saviour laid down such a rule as that delivered to us by the Reformation Society? But we find what our blessed Redeemer did, when asked by a person what he should do; *he sent him to another*; he did not tell him to go and read the Scriptures. That person was St. Paul. St. Paul, when he received the grace of miraculous conversion, said: "Who art thou, Lord?" The answer was: "I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest." St. Paul, corresponding with the grace which he had received, replied: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" The answer was: "Arise, and go into the city, and *it shall be told thee* what thou shalt do." Now here was an opportunity to tell him to go and read the Scriptures, to learn what he had to know from the Scriptures alone; but there is no such direction given. He was told by Christ he is to go to Ananias, who was *to tell him what to do*. See Acts ix. 5—7. Again, in the next chapter, Cornelius was visited by an angel, who also does not tell him to read the Scriptures, and from them find out the truth, but he refers him to Peter. Here are two cases, in one of which an angel is commissioned to direct Cornelius to Peter for instruction; in the other, our blessed Saviour himself sends St. Paul to learn the mystery of the vocation of the Gentiles from the disciple Ananias. In fact, Christ no where tells us that Scripture is the only rule of instruction.

Mr. Tottenham has referred to Deut. vi. 6, in which Moses tells the people to have the law before their eyes, to write it on the door-posts, to have it as a sign upon

their hands, and, in fact, to have it constantly with them. "And these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up, and thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes, and thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house, and on thy gates." Now will Mr. Tottenham say that this means the whole Scripture? Will Mr. Tottenham say that the people of the Jews were to take *the whole of the Pentateuch*, and to write it upon the door-posts, to take it as a sign upon their hands, and place it before their eyes, &c.? Mr. Tottenham cannot surely deliver himself of such an absurdity. But what is the fact? Why we know from the history of the Jews how they complied with these instructions. Dr. A. Clarke says they wrote out certain texts of Scripture, to the amount of thirty verses; these they *did* bind upon their foreheads, and *did* keep on their hands, and *did* write upon the entry of their doors. What were they? They were the commandments, and directions relative to certain ceremonies and observances which Almighty God enjoined them to keep. But see the extent of Scripture! [*The Rev. Gentleman here pointed, from a large Bible which he held in his hand, to the extent of the Pentateuch.*] Was that to be written, and to be held before their eyes, and to be written upon the door-posts?

But, says Mr. Tottenham, Moses tells us nothing besides the written word, to which the people were referred. Does Mr. Tottenham mean to adhere to that declaration? Does he mean to say that no contingencies were imagined, according to which the people might be ignorant of the meaning of the words? that there was no provision made for the understanding of it? If so, he certainly has overlooked the declaration of Almighty God in the same book, in the 17th chapter. *He* supposes there may be some difficulty; for in the 8th verse it is said:—

"If there shall arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment, between blood and blood, and *between plea and plea*, and between stroke and stroke, being matters of controversy within thy gates, then shalt thou arise, and get thee up into the place which the Lord thy God shall choose, and thou shalt come *unto the priests the Levites*, and *unto the judge* that shall be in those days, to inquire, and they shall shew thee the sentence of judgment."

And, in fact, he says afterwards, that if a person does

not attend to this he shall die: “even that man shall die, and thou shalt put away evil from Israel.” Now, Sir, here is some addition to the written word;—hereby was some authority assigned to explain the meaning of that word;—whatever that authority might be, it was something in addition to the mere letter of Scripture. The people of Israel were told that if any difficulty or controversy should arise, they were to go to the judges and to the priests. In another portion of Scripture there is a still clearer testimony on this subject; to shew what were the points upon which the judges had to decide, and those upon which the priests had to decide. It is in the 2nd of Chronicles, or Paralipomenon, chap. xix. verse 8:—

“Moreover in Jerusalem did Jehoshaphat set of the Levites, and of the priests, and of the chief of the fathers of Israel, for the judgment of the Lord, and for controversies, when they returned from Jerusalem. And he charged them, saying, Thus shall ye do in the fear of the Lord, faithfully, and with a perfect heart. And what cause soever shall come to you of your brethren that dwell in their cities, between blood and blood, between *law and commandment, statutes and judgments*, ye shall even warn them that they trespass not against the Lord . . . . And behold Amariah *the chief priest is over you in all matters of the Lord*; and Zebediah the son of Ishmael, the ruler of the house of Judah, for all the King’s matters.”

This is an explanation of the part the judges and priests respectively were required to act in the case mentioned in the 17th chap. of Deuteronomy. In both passages does the Scripture admit that some difficulty may arise respecting the meaning of the divine word; and in those difficulties the people were not to be satisfied with their own conjectures, but there was appointed an authority to assist them in learning the true meaning of the divine word.

We are told, that if a person needs any assistance, and if he prays, he will then receive the Spirit of God, and be infallibly led to the truth. Now, Sir, my friends and myself have been praying for the Spirit of God this day; and I certainly feel that I (and for them also I do not fear to answer) have prayed with the same sincerity as if eternity depended on the success of our prayers. It is not for me to deny that Mr. Tottenham has done the like, nor is it for Mr. Tottenham to say that we have not so prayed; yet we come to quite different conclusions. It is very certain that we are not all infallible; yet, says Mr. Tottenham, those who ask for the Spirit of God shall receive it, and be infallibly led to the truth. Here does he substitute for the in-

fallibility of the Church, the infallibility of each private individual; and in fact he is bound by his principle, that the rule of faith which God has given,—the mere letter of the sacred volume,—must be interpreted by each man's individual judgment, he is bound to come to this conclusion, that every individual is infallible. Yes; he who has a difficulty in believing that the whole assembled body of the Church of God, assembled under the promise of the guidance of the Spirit of God, with the promise of the perpetual presence of the Son of God,—he who denies that the persons thus solemnly assembled, and reposing in the promises of Christ, shall be infallibly led to the truth; yet says that every individual shall be infallible, if he applies for the Spirit of God; for he says that every one who sincerely prays for the Spirit of God, shall receive it, and by it he shall be led to the truth.

Mr. Tottenham, after having cleared the body of Protestants from that very troublesome class called Unitarians, says that as to all the rest, their differences are on non-essentials. Now this is really extraordinary, for a person who has read something, undoubtedly, of the history of the changes in religion which took place in the 16th century, (I do not like to say the history of Protestants, because I wish not to give offence to any one by using that term in connection with those extraordinary events, upon which I am sure Mr. Tottenham must look back with shame,) when, in the name of religion, all Europe was devastated and deluged with blood,—when those scenes were enacted in this country, which have laid waste so many of the fair edifices that heretofore dignified and beautified England, and which indeed terminated by the shedding of the blood of the monarch on the scaffold. Will Mr. Tottenham tell me that these things were matters of no importance? Will he now tell me that; or come to the disgraceful subterfuge, that it is a matter of little consequence what you believe, provided you do not believe certain errors which the Catholic believes, nor such as the poor Unitarian believes, for which he is excluded from Christianity?

I suppose Mr. Tottenham believes the Thirty-nine Articles; at least his Church professes to believe them; though we have been told, indeed, that the clergy sign them with a smile or a sigh. The Church, I say, of which he is a minister, is committed to the Thirty-nine Articles. Now (to say nothing of the inconsistency of adding those

Thirty-nine Articles, when the people have got the Bible without them), according to these Articles, do they not believe in the necessity of baptism? Does not the Quaker, on the other hand, declare the reverse? Rather, I will first go to the Anabaptist. The Anabaptist declares that it is not necessary at a certain time of life, for which, according to him, Christ has made no provision. The Quaker says it is not necessary at all, but, on the contrary, is a superstition. Now I ask Mr. Tottenham, if baptism be necessary to salvation, is it not of some importance that persons *differ on these points*? Do you not differ on points of importance with other classes, and their respective ministers? I wish to call your attention to a former organ of the Reformation Society. They are perpetually changing their opinions; but I suppose they are always right. Mr. Gordon said, “We give the Bible to destroy Methodism and Fanaticism, to destroy Socinianism and Infidelity.” Here the application of the rule was, that it was to destroy systems whose errors in religion, according to Mr. Tottenham, are of no consequence. See how perpetually these persons are misleading you. They tell you one thing to-day, and another to-morrow. They pay you such a wretched compliment, as to say to-day, you must believe that 2 and 2 make 4, and the next day, that 2 and 2 make 5.

In the next place, I ask if Mr. Tottenham believes that any person ever made out his religion solely from the Bible? Sir, I am speaking now to parents: I am speaking to those persons who consider themselves, and justly consider themselves, as appointed by Almighty God to conduct their little ones to everlasting salvation: I am addressing those who must be impressed with the importance of the charge committed to them, who must feel horror at the idea of leading those little ones to perdition, by allowing them to offend God: I ask those parents whether, in the discharge of their duty, they would wait until their children were capable of reading, and then, putting the Bible into their hands, say: “I have nothing more to do with you on the subject of religion?” Would they venture to do this? There is not a person present who would be guilty of such an atrocious act. No! You answer the demands of those little ones who cry out for bread; and at the moment their infant minds expand, and they begin to lisp the name of God, you instil into their

minds the beginnings of the knowledge of God, distilling, as I may say, drops of celestial dew : gradually you teach the beautiful truths of the Christian religion, the ineffable love of that blessed Saviour, who, being in the form of God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God, but descended on the earth, and became as a mere servant to satisfy his love for those little ones. Parents teach these truths ; and the clergy also teach them catechisms, which parents send them to church to learn : but for all this there is no need, if Scripture alone is sufficient ; there is no need for parents to send their children to church to hear the Thirty-nine Articles read and expounded, if Scripture alone is sufficient. Therefore, I say, no person does make out his religion, or ever did, by the Bible alone. Oh ! if they did, we should have been spared many a scene over which we have wept very lately ; and where would have been the necessity of this Society at all ? They tell us that they only wish the Catholics to exercise private judgment, and that they never wish to force their judgment. I cannot charge Mr. Tottenham personally with any inconsistency of conduct on this head ; but it is not in this neighbourhood that such an assertion should be made. It is cruelly true that the consciences of Catholics in this neighbourhood would have been forced, if they had not been strengthened by power from on high, which defies the efforts of ingenious malice. Catholics are excluded from the charities of certain members of the Established Church in this neighbourhood ; they are excluded from the charities of others in every neighbourhood ; they are excluded at Cheltenham constantly ; they are excluded at Birmingham, where they are perpetually persecuted in domestic life. Sometimes members of the same family are told they must never speak to their relatives ; they must not be identified with them. All this is not forcing the consciences of Catholics ! It is not, indeed, forcing them *to exercise* private judgment : no ! it is forcing them *to violate* private judgment ; it is forcing them to go against the dictates of conscience. How many a pang has a poor widow felt, when her little child, deprived of sustenance, must starve, or she must purchase food for it at the expense of its soul ! And these scenes are perpetually occurring.

Again, if the principle of these gentlemen had been consistently maintained, we should not have had to weep

over those slaughters which sully every page of the history of poor Ireland. We should never have wept over the battles and murders of Skibbereen, Newton Barry, and Moncoin. There have been more murders committed, more horrible slaughters - - - -

The CHAIRMAN here intimated that the Reverend Gentleman's time had expired.

---

THE REV. JOHN LYONS.

I HAVE been listening, Sir, with some attention to all parts of the Reverend Gentleman's declaration, but more especially to the latter clause of it, and may I be permitted to ask him what have the miseries of Ireland—what have the sorrows of mine own native land, to do with the rule of faith? I could weep over the sorrows and miseries of that country, and, were it necessary, (but it forms no part of the present discussion,) I might trace them to their source. But thus much I may say, that so far from Roman Catholics being excluded from the charities of that country, I do assert, that all the charities throughout it, or the greater number at least, are supported by Protestant liberality. I will speak no more on this subject, but betake myself to the consideration of some of the assertions which the Reverend Gentleman has made regarding the rule of faith.

I also feel, as he does, that I must answer to the God of heaven and earth for what I may teach to my people. I would desire to feel that truth strongly impressed on my soul from day to day, as I walk through the district that hath been allotted to me wherein to preach the Gospel, and to distribute the word from house to house. I feel that every day that passeth over me is only adding a new day of responsibility to my existence in this world; and being one of those who must give account for souls entrusted to their charge, I desire to speak as the Apostle Peter saith: "Let him that speaketh, speak as the oracles of God."



It is not to human opinion that I will now call your attention, but to the written word of the Living God,—that word which is acknowledged, both by Protestants and Roman Catholics, to be written by inspiration.

In the first place I shall address myself to those opinions that Mr. Macdonnell has expressed respecting the corrupt Bible that hath been distributed through this country. I know not whether the Reverend Gentleman alludes to the authorized version of the Scriptures that hath been sent forth by the Bible Society and the Church of England, or to some corrupt translation that hath gone forth, of which I have never heard. He has not, however, specified to you a single one of the corruptions of that word,—he has not turned your attention to a single passage in the word of the authorized translation that has been corrupted; but, so far from this being the case, we can shew, on the other side, that even Roman Catholics themselves esteem our authorized version of Holy Scripture to be a good one; for Dr. Doyle, a priest in Ireland, speaking of that translation, said, It was a noble work.

But, to pass the opinion of an individual, let us come to the Douay Bible, which I hold in my hand; and what do we find in it? In the New Testament alone, I have here lying before me several passages that have been changed in various editions, and *every change of these passages has only brought them nearer and nearer to the authorized version of Holy Scripture*. I shall quote one or two of these passages, and from them you may judge of the others.

In the 1st chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, and 7th verse, in the Rhemish edition of the New Testament, published in 1582, I read that verse thus translated:—

“As it is reasonable for me, this to think for all you, for that I have you in heart, and in my bands, and in the defence and the confirmation of the Gospel, all you to be partakers of my joy.”

In the edition of 1829 it is thus translated:—“As it is *meet* for me.” Here the word “reasonable” is changed for the expression “meet,” adopted from the authorized version. “As it is meet for me to think this for you all, for that I have you in my heart”—in the edition of 1582 it is “in heart”—“that in my bands, and in the defence and confirmation of the Gospel, you all are partakers of my joy.” I give you this one verse as a sufficient specimen

out of a number that might be quoted, were it necessary now to do so.

How cometh it to pass that the Church of Rome hath published these various editions of the Bible, differing so materially the one from the other, and each correction and change in language causing them more closely to resemble the authorized translation?

I also ask Mr. Macdonnell to account for the fact of Sixtus the Fifth putting forth a Bible, in the preface of which he declares, that he had assembled together all the most learned men, from almost the whole of the Christian world, to ensure its correctness, and yet that Clement the Eighth discovered that so many errors had crept into this edition, as to make it necessary to publish a new edition of the Vulgate Bible.

The argument drawn by the Reverend Gentleman from the corruption of translations, resembles the elephants of old, who retreated on their own camp, and destroyed the host they were brought to defend.

Mr. Macdonnell has told us, that contradictory declarations cannot both come from God, — that He does not teach both the Unitarian and the believer in the Deity of Christ. This is a self-evident truth; and had he examined the declaration of the Council of Trent, he would have found that any man who denies the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ, rests under the anathema of that Council; and therefore, according to his own principle, the Unitarian could not have been taught of God. But the Church of England does not receive the Unitarian as a member of the Church of Christ; for in her creeds and articles there are plain declarations which make up this proposition—That the Unitarian cannot be a Christian.

When the Reverend Gentleman was dwelling on this subject, he said that the Unitarians have the same rule of faith we have. Now I beg to deny that position; for the Unitarian has *not* the same rule of faith. Mr. Belsham, one of the chief leaders among them, has acknowledged that the Unitarian does not believe in the Plenary Inspiration of the Word of God,—that is, he does not believe that the whole of the Bible has been written by inspiration,—he does not receive this truth, that “holy men of God spoke, inspired by the Holy Ghost.” In order to prove that they have not the same rule of faith, they have published a New Testament, which they call an Improved Version, in which many passages of the authorized version

are omitted or changed, evidently shewing that the Unitarian and we have not the same rule of faith.

But again—the Gentleman has told us “that Christ alone could give a rule,” and then he puts this question—“Is there any part of Christ’s conduct that shews that the Scripture is that rule?” Now I think there are various parts of Christ’s conduct that shew very clearly that the Scriptures were the only rule that he acknowledged. Turn, in the first place, to the 4th chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, and there, when Christ “was tempted of the devil,” you find him invariably using, against the temptations of Satan, the words, “*It is written.*”—Jesus answered and said, “*It is written.*”—Again Jesus said, “*It is written.*” Here then we find that our Lord Jesus Christ, in his own practice, when he was contending against Satan, appealed, not to any tradition,—not to any new rule,—but simply, and solely, to the Scriptures of the Old Testament; he drew out of the armoury of God the only shafts that it pleased him to use in his defence against Satan; and what was the issue? Satan shrunk from the contest, baffled and subdued;—“he then left him;”—the Son overcame by the word of God—Satan departed, “and angels came and ministered” to the Lord Jesus Christ.

Moreover, when we proceed in the history of Jesus, in the opening of the 15th chapter of Matthew, we find him arguing against the traditions of the Pharisees, and supporting the authority of holy writ.

“Then came to him from Jerusalem Scribes and Pharisees, saying, Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the ancients? For they wash not their hands when they eat bread. But he answering, said to them: Why do you also transgress the commandment of God for your tradition? For God said, Honour thy father and mother: and, He that shall curse father or mother, let him die the death.”

Here he teaches us that adherence to tradition was a transgression of the commandments of God,—that where the tradition is not in accordance with the written word, it will only lead men away from that word. He then quotes certain passages, to shew how they perverted this rule by the glosses of their traditions, and then quotes from the prophet Isaias, saying—

“This people honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. And in vain do they worship me, teaching doctrines and commandments of men.”

From these instances of Christ’s practice, together with many more to which we cannot now direct your attention,

we learn that it was our Lord's invariable custom to appeal to Holy Scripture.

We now pass from the practice of Christ, to examine whether He hath not also given to the Apostles a *command to write* the Holy Scriptures. Mr. Macdonnell said that Christ never told them to write. Yesterday, when Mr. Tottenham was arguing on this question, he shewed that the very fact of inspiration was a sufficient command, and therefore it is unnecessary for me now to go over that part of the argument; but I will come to the express declarations of the Apostles themselves on this subject of writing.

Take, in the first place, the book of the Apocalypse, or the Revelation. In the 1st chapter and 10th and 11th verses of this book it is written :—

“ I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying, What thou seest **WRITE IN A BOOK.**”

Here is the command of the Lord Jesus Christ—“ What thou seest, **WRITE IN A BOOK.**”—Again, in the 19th verse of the same chapter :—

“ **WRITE** therefore the things which thou hast seen, and which are and which must be done hereafter.”

Again, in the 1st verse of the 2nd chapter :—

“ Unto the angel of the church of Ephesus **WRITE.**”

Again, in the 8th verse :—

“ Unto the angel of the church of Smyrna **WRITE.**”

Again, in the 12th verse :—

“ Unto the angel of the church in Pergamos **WRITE.**”

Again, in the 18th verse :—

“ Unto the angel of the church of Thyatira **WRITE.**”

Again, in the 3rd chapter and 1st verse :—

“ Unto the angel of the church in Sardis **WRITE.**”

And in the 7th verse :—

“ To the angel of the church in Philadelphia **WRITE.**”

Again, in the 14th verse :—

“ To the angel of the Laodiceans **WRITE.**”

Again, in the 14th chapter of the same book, when God would comfort his own children under the scenes of manifold affliction to which they may be exposed, in the day of persecution, in the 12th and 13th verses it is said :—

“ Here is the patience of the saints who keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. And I heard a voice from heaven, saying to me : **WRITE**, Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord. From henceforth now, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours : for their works do follow them.”

Again, in the 21st chapter and 5th verse it is said :—

“ **WRITE**, for these words are most faithful and true.”

Here we read the same command “ **TO WRITE**,” several times repeated from the Lord to the Apostle John.

Let us now turn to the 1st Epistle of St. John, the 1st chapter and 3rd verse, where it is said :—

“ That which we have seen and have heard we declare unto you, that you also may have fellowship with us, and our fellowship may be with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ.”

Here the Apostle distinctly tells us, that whatsoever things he had seen and heard respecting the Lord Jesus Christ, he had declared to those whom he thus addressed, in order that they might have fellowship with him, and with the Lord Jesus Christ ; and then he adds in the next verse what he means by “ *declaring* :”—

“ These things **WE WRITE** to you, that you may rejoice, and your joy may be full.”

The object in *writing* to the Church was, that it might have this record, and might hand it down to future ages, that both may rejoice, and that their joy might be full.

When he would also warn them against sin, and comfort their hearts when they had fallen into and been convinced of their sin, he uses the instrument of writing. In the opening of the 2nd chapter he says :—

“ My little children, these things I **WRITE** to you that you may not sin.”

In this instance also it was not left to oral tradition to convey the warning voice to future ages ; but to exhort against sin he saith, “ these things I **WRITE** to you.”

Again, in the 12th, 13th, and 14th verses, he writes for the comfort of God's children :—

“ I **WRITE** unto you, little children, because your sins are forgiven you for his name's sake. I **WRITE** unto you, fathers, because you have known him, who is from the beginning. I **WRITE** unto you, young men, because you have overcome the wicked one. I **WRITE** unto you, babes, because you have known the Father. I **WRITE** unto you, young men, because you are strong, and the word of God abideth in you, and you have overcome the wicked one.”

In the 21st verse he says :—

“ I have not **WRITTEN** to you as to them that know not the truth.”

In the 26th verse :—

“ These things have I WRITTEN to you, concerning them that seduce you.”

The last passage to which I shall refer in this Epistle, is the 5th chapter and the 13th verse,—

“ These things WRITE I to you, that you may know that you have eternal life, you who believe in the name of the Son of God.”

Here is the grand use of writing, to convey the assurance of salvation to the Church of God.

What means do men always employ, in respect of evidence, among themselves? They will not trust to tradition,—they will not trust their wills, nor their leases, nor any of their usual concerns, to oral tradition,—to be handed down from mouth to mouth, because they know how easily these things can be corrupted if they be unwritten. And therefore God himself, for the assurance of his own children, hath written unto them,—and therefore, in this 13th verse, it is said :—“ These things I WRITE to you,” (for what purpose?) “ that ye may know that ye have eternal life, you who believe in the name of the Son of God.”

The Church of Rome tells us in her decree, that unwritten traditions are to be received with the same reverence as the written word of God. But in these passages of St. John’s Epistle, we find that the written word of God is amply sufficient for all the wants of the child of God :—if he wishes to avoid sin, let him take the written word, and use it as the “ Sword of the Spirit” against the devil, and he will flee from him. Doth he require to be comforted under the trials of life? It is written :—

“ Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord. From henceforth now, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours.”

Doth he require assurance of God’s love towards him?

“ These things I WRITE unto you, that you may know that you have eternal life.”

In the 1st Epistle to Timothy, and the 3rd chapter, we read these words that have been quoted several times during this discussion; they are contained in the 14th and 15th verses :—

“ These things I WRITE to thee, hoping that I shall come to thee shortly. But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the pillar and ground of the truth.”

With the latter part of the 15th verse we have at present no reference; it is generally brought forward in support

of Infallibility; and I wish to confine myself to the subject under immediate consideration—that the written word is the rule of faith. But here the Apostle Paul saith to Timothy, “These things I write to thee, hoping that I shall come to thee shortly; but if I tarry long, that”—as the Greek word expresses it—“*in order* that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God.” If then we want to know how we are to behave ourselves in the house of God, we have it WRITTEN by the Apostle Paul:—

“These things I WRITE to thee, - - - in order that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God.”

In the Epistle to the Philippians, the 3rd chapter and the 1st verse, it is said:

“To WRITE the same things to you, to me indeed is not wearisome, but to you it is necessary.”

The Apostle had no idea of leaving one part of the truth to be handed down by oral tradition, and another part to be committed to writing, but he says, “To write the same things” (to repeat in writing the same things to them, that they might be the more deeply impressed on their minds,) “To write the same things to you, to me indeed is not wearisome, but to you it is necessary.”

In the 2nd Epistle of Peter, at the opening of the 3rd chapter, he saith:—

“Behold, this second Epistle I WRITE to you, my dearly beloved, in which I stir up, by way of admonition, your sincere mind; that you may be mindful of those words which I told you before from the holy prophets, and of your Apostles, of the precepts of the Lord and Saviour.”

Here the Apostle shews us, that it is only by the written word of God, by a constant and unvarying appeal to that word, and to no other authority, that we can stir up the pure minds of the brethren, and put them in remembrance of the commandments of the Lord Jesus Christ, and of his holy Apostles.

When we turn to the Epistle to the Church of Rome,—I do not mean as she now is, but as she was in the days of the Apostles,—in the opening of that Epistle, Paul declares that he was “a servant of Jesus Christ,”—that he was “called to be an Apostle,” that he was “separated unto the Gospel of God, which he had promised before by his Prophets IN THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.” This is remarkable;—the Apostle commences his Epistle to the Church of Rome as if he foresaw the error that



afterwards would creep into that Church,—the error of joining traditions to the written word; for at the fore front of the Epistle he puts the Prophets—“which he had promised before by his Prophets in the Holy Scripture.” Then it is remarkable that it should be not only declared at the *beginning*, but also at the *ending* of this Epistle; for we read in the 16th chapter and 26th verse:—

“Which now is made manifest by THE SCRIPTURES OF THE PROPHETS.”

The Epistle to the Church of Rome thus *begins and closes by a direct appeal to the Scriptures* written by the Holy Prophets. There is also another remarkable circumstance occurring in this Epistle, and it only shews how the Holy Ghost as it were foresaw all those things that would enter into that Church; even the manner in which she would appeal to tradition, and depart from the written word of the living God. In this Epistle to the Romans there are but 16 chapters, according to the authorized version and the Douay Bible. In these 16 chapters, the Apostle, or rather the Spirit of God, quotes upwards of 60 passages out of the Old Testament Scriptures, but never appeals to a single traditionary record. Compare any of the other Epistles with this to the Romans, and you will not find, *comparatively*, so much of the Old Testament quoted, as you may read in this Epistle. Turn to the Epistle to the Galatians, for instance, where the Apostle is writing on the same subject as that contained in the Epistle to the Romans,—Justification by Faith. In that Epistle there are 6 chapters, and he only introduces 10 or 11 passages, but never alludes to tradition in any part of it.

Mr. Macdonnell has told us that we are in the habit of putting off the poor and ignorant person when he comes to us, by saying, “Go to the word of God, and read therein for yourself;” and he puts the case of a man who cannot read, who, through neglect or other circumstances in early life, has never learned letters, as coming to a Protestant Minister for instruction, and by him referred to a book that he cannot read. This, however, is not the practice of the Ministers of the Church of England. Mr. Macdonnell may perhaps be aware of the fact of our being in the habit of visiting amongst our people, and where they cannot read, reading for them, and, as the Apostles did, “teaching and preaching from house to house, the

things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ." It is unnecessary, however, for me to dwell further on this subject.

He has also told us, as an argument against the word of God, that various opinions exist among Protestants respecting the interpretation of this book. The Rev. Mr. Tottenham yesterday told you of the divisions that existed in the Corinthian Church; and Mr. Brown, in advertising to the answer that Mr. Tottenham gave on that subject, said—"They were not disputing so much about doctrines as men do now." A simple appeal to the First Epistle to the Corinthians would evidently show that there were divisions of a serious nature in that Church, for in the 11th chapter of the 1st Epistle, he speaks of heresies being in the Church. In the 19th verse he says—

"There must be also heresies, that they also, who are reprov'd, may be made manifest among you."

One of these heresies we read of in the 15th chap. of the 1st Epistle, where we learn that some persons had denied the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, as Paul, throughout that chapter, is meeting the objections of some individuals who said there was no resurrection of the dead; and of other persons who asked with what body do they come? From this Epistle we see that there were differences, and divisions, and heresies, in that primitive Church.

Do we not also read in the 2nd Epistle to Timothy of Hymenæus and Philetus, who erred from the truth, saying—

"That the resurrection is past already, and have subverted the faith of some?"

Yet these persons professed to belong to the Church of that day.

Do we not read in the 3rd Epistle of John, of "Diotrephes, who loved to have the pre-eminence," and who would not receive the letter that the Apostle sent to the Church? Were not these serious differences prevailing in the early Christian Church?

Do we not also discover very many divisions existing in the bosom of the Church of Rome? Have not the Scotists and the Thomists disputed warmly about the nature of original sin? The Franciscans and the Dominicans about the Immaculate conception? The Jesuits and Jansenists on the subject of grace? Were there not divisions among the infallible Doctors of the Council of Trent? For instance, on the subject of Communion in one kind, one hun-

dred and sixty-six votes were thus divided :—twenty-nine approved of conceding the cup to the laity ; thirty-one were on the same side, but wished the execution of the proposed decree to be committed to the discretion and will of the Pope ; thirty-eight opposed it altogether ; twenty-four referred the whole matter to the Pope ; nineteen inclined to the concession, as far as the Bohemians and Hungarians were concerned, but denied it to all others ; fourteen desired the postponement of the subject ; eleven were undecided or neuter. Pallavicini, lib. xviii. cap. 4.—Sarpi, lib. vi. § 63 : quoted by Crampe in the “ Text Book of Popery.”

After the decrees of the Council of Trent upon Justification came forth, there was a difference of opinion between Soto and Andrew Vega, on the subject of Justification ; and both appealed to the decree of the Council in support of their contradictory statements. Here, then, are divisions existing in the Primitive Church, and divisions in the Church of Rome, even at the very time of the Council of Trent : but I will not dwell longer on these divisions. Let the Church of Rome boast of her unity, but wherever there is *life*, there must be differences of opinion—wheresoever men meet in the busy haunts of human existence, there will be differences—let them engage in the ordinary occupations of the day, and there will be diversities of sentiment. When men engage in the pleasures of life, they will differ in their opinion as to what is pleasure ; but if you enter the tombs of the dead and walk amid the range of coffins, all is silence ; even so it is with the members of the Church of Rome, and so it is not with the members of the Protestant Churches. In the former a man’s reason is blinded—he is manacled, and tied down to the Church, there is, therefore, no appeal to his reason, or to his powers of understanding, and when you crush down the human mind and *force* it to flow in one channel, there must be uniformity ; but it is the uniformity produced by fear or by ignorance. But when you meet with men who enjoy the word of the Living God, and are permitted to use their reason, as the Apostle saith—“ I appeal unto you as wise men,” then there will be differences of opinion, and whilst these differences exist, thanks be to God, we can preserve “ The unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.” We can differ on some points, and the greater number of these are non-essentials, but on the grand and vital questions we agree—

as concerning the only means of salvation ;—the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ ;—his Incarnation and glorious work of Redemption ;—and the work of the Holy Spirit in regenerating and teaching the children of God.

Do we not find the Church of God, scattered as it is to the four winds of Heaven, yet combined and united in leading the sinner to the only source of eternal life—in acknowledging that there is only one name given under heaven amongst men whereby we can be saved, even the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The Rev. Gentleman referred us to the 9th chap. of the Acts of the Apostles, as shewing that man was not sent to Scripture in the first place ; for that the Apostle Paul was sent to Ananias, and that by him he was to be taught what he was to do, and accordingly—

“ Ananias went his way, and entered into the house : and laying his hands upon him, he said ; Brother Saul, the Lord Jesus hath sent me, he that appeared to thee in the way as thou camest.”

But for what purpose was Ananias sent? Was it to teach him the doctrine of the Lord Jesus? By no means ; but—

“ That thou mayest *receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost*. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it were scales, and he received his sight ; and rising up he was *baptized*.” v. 17.

But in the 1st chap. of the Epistle to the Galatians, the Apostle Paul tells us the manner in which he was taught. In the 15th verse of the 1st chap. we read—

“ But when it pleased him, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles, immediately I condescended not to flesh and blood.”

The Greek ought rather to be translated “ I *conferred* not ;” but for very obvious reasons “ *condescended*” was put in.

“ Neither went I to Jerusalem to the Apostles who were before me ; but I went into Arabia, and again I returned to Damascus.”

Here he tells us that it was not from man he had learned the truth, but—

“ When it pleased him - - - to reveal his Son in me—immediately I condescended not to flesh and blood.”

And in the 11th and 12th verses of this same chapter, he gives us to understand that the Gospel which was preached by him is not according to man,—

“ For neither did I receive it of man, nor did I learn it ; but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.”

Mr. Macdonnell has also referred us to the 10th of Acts—to the case of Cornelius—and he says that Cornelius was not referred to the written word of God. Now it appears that Cornelius did understand the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ *before* St. Peter came to him, because in the 36th verse we find the Apostle saith,—

“ God sent the word to the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ: (he is Lord of all). You know the word which hath been published through all Judea.”

Here it appears that the Centurion was not ignorant of the word of God, for St. Peter appeals to his knowledge of it when he says, “ YOU KNOW THE WORD,” and then he begins to preach to him,—

“ Jesus of Nazareth : how God anointed him with the Holy Ghost, and with power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed by the Devil, for God was with him.”

Then at the close of the chapter we discover what was the end of Peter's coming ; it was, that the signs of an Apostle might be wrought amongst them.

“ For while Peter was yet speaking these words the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word—and he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.”

God sent his Apostle that day to the Centurion and his friends, in order that they might be witnesses for God amongst the Jews that it had pleased Him to visit the Gentiles, and to gather out from that body a people for his own glory. The Apostle came there in order that through him might be manifested the power of God in giving the Holy Ghost to the Gentiles, that they might speak with tongues and magnify God, and then that the Centurion, and they that were with him, might “ be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.”

But the Rev. Gentleman dwelt for a considerable time upon the 6th chapter of Deuteronomy, which was referred to yesterday by Mr. Tottenham ; and in order further to show that the word there spoken was somewhat more than the written word, he appeals to a single verse which is contained in the 17th chapter of the same book. He appears to appeal to this chapter and verse in order to show us the difference between judges and priests. We do not hesitate for a moment in our belief that judges and priests are not engaged in the same occupation. But in the 17th of Deuteronomy, to which the Rev. Gentleman has referred, it appears that the subject there spoken of

is purely a matter of temporal concernment, and not in any respect of spiritual bearing. It is a case common among men, and known among us as the law of assault, or of cutting and maiming, &c.

“ If thou perceive that there be among you a hard and doubtful matter in judgment between blood and blood, cause and cause, leprosy and leprosy : and thou see that the words of the judges within thy gates do vary : arise, go up to the place which the Lord thy God shall choose.” v. 8.

In the case here specified there is only an appeal, concerning a temporal matter, from a lower to a higher court of judicature, which can by no means prove that there was any unwritten tradition to govern their decision. In their differences and difficulties they were not to take the law into their own hands and avenge their own quarrel, but were to abide by the final decision “ of the priests of the Levitical race and of the judge that shall be at that time.” There is a written law amongst us—but who can take the law into his own hands and put a man to death? If a man be deprived of his property, will he take the law in his own hands, and force the property back again? Nay, he must go to the judges of the land—to the constituted authorities—that all things may be done decently and in order—it is a matter of public justice—

---

THE REV. T. J. BROWN.

It was my intention that nothing should induce me to deviate from that line of argument whereby I intend to demonstrate that Scripture is not *the only Rule* of Faith, and that tradition also is necessary to complete that rule. I will not, however, adhere so rigidly to the purpose, as not to remark cursorily upon the principal objections brought against my arguments by Mr. Tottenham.

He began by stating that he considered that their Rule of Faith was not to be urged against Protestants only, but that he might also be allowed to argue against the Catholic rule. I should not have objected to his arguing against the Catholic doctrine, had he not made his arguments against the Catholic rule almost the only subject on which he dilated. But (although it is not so expressed in the printed bills of the Discussion) we had engaged to dispute upon the *Protestant rule only*; for, when I met

Mr. T. at the house of a common friend, he must recollect our agreement, that if *he* impugned a point of Catholic doctrine, *I* should be authorised in attacking a point of Protestant doctrine, and it was only on this understanding that I consented to the discussion. Mr. T. has, therefore, strictly no right, as an honourable man, whatever he may claim from the printed bills, *to attack* the Catholic doctrine on the Rule of Faith.

Mr. T. has asserted that I violated the principle on which we met, when I appealed to tradition in support of my Rule of Faith. It was not, in the first instance, to support the Catholic rule that I appealed to tradition, but to show that the Protestant rule was not complete, that tradition forms *a part of the rule*, which Christ left to his Church, and that as Protestants exclude tradition, they have *not a complete Rule* of Faith. In reply to my objection from the Apostle's doctrine of tradition in 1 Cor. ii. 34. He said that the Apostle was treating of circumstances peculiar to the Christian Church, and he cited the 11th verse of the 1st chap. Yes, the Apostle was treating of matters peculiar to the Corinthian Church; but Mr. T. has not shewn that those matters did not regard doctrines of faith; he has not shewn that these matters did not regard doctrines to be handed down to future ages amongst the revelations of Christ. "Let the Catholic Church produce," he added, "the identical tradition of which the Apostle speaks." This sophistry I know how to value, and I dare say most of you do also. It is sufficient if we establish that the Apostles communicated orally certain revelations which are not written, and that these constitute the traditions of the Church of Rome, without our being called on to determine precisely which are the identical traditions that the Apostle delivered to the Corinthians.

Mr. T. again objected to me the 25th v. of the 21st chap. of John, and endeavoured to shew thence that all things necessary to salvation were contained in that gospel; but his argument proves too much, for it would prove that the two miracles, to which St. John refers, were sufficient. He will remember, also, that *there were* "*many other things* which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, the world could not contain the books which should be written." It was for me to prove, Mr. T. argued, that these traditions are essential to salvation. It is sufficient to answer that any one who rejects *any doctrine manifested by Christ*, exposes himself to the imminent peril



of damnation; for Christ says in Mark xvi. 16. "He that believeth not," (without setting any other bounds to his belief than the whole of the good tidings which he had revealed) "shall be damned."

Mr. T. bade me remember my declaration, that the Gospel of St. John was written after his 2nd Epistle, wherein, verse 12, the Apostle speaks of several things which he would deliver, when he should see those to whom he wrote face to face. Now, *I* did not state, as *my* opinion, that the Gospel of St. John was written afterwards; nay, I said that there were some eminent Biblical critics who maintained that the Gospel of St. John was written before.—He tells you that the Apostle did write the same truths he orally delivered; this again is a point I do not *altogether* dispute; I acknowledge it in some instances; but the question is, did he write ALL the truths that he orally delivered? Was there any command on the part of Christ, or manifest disposition on the part of his Apostles, to write ALL the truths that Christ had revealed.

He tells you that St. Jude's prophecy from Enoch was made known to that Apostle by inspiration: this is a gratuitous assertion, and I am equally justified in saying he must have known it from tradition only.—He stated that the fathers were divided amongst themselves on a variety of points, and he quoted largely from Bellarmine, to shew that the fathers were so divided. I had informed you that the doctrines delivered by the fathers are proposed as matters of Catholic faith only when the fathers *are morally unanimous* in their teaching; and that when they are divided upon any point, that doctrine is not a part of Catholic tradition. Now, in the instance objected to me, the diversity of sentiment among the fathers was not upon points of Catholic doctrine, but upon the interpretation of certain obscure passages of Scripture. Hence, the legitimate conclusion at most is that there is no clear tradition, as to the meaning of those passages; but the fathers did not deny any one of the defined doctrines of the Catholic faith, to support which those passages of Scripture are sometimes adduced.

Mr. Tottenham informs you that Catholics also are divided amongst themselves on several points; and Mr. Lyons even brought forward several instances of such divisions. Now, not one of these regards matters of *Catholic faith*; not one of these divisions upholds any doctrine contrary thereto, as my opponent pretended; they

were all concerning matters *of opinion only*. But between *opinion* and *faith* there is the widest difference, which I apprehend the gentlemen on the other side do not clearly comprehend. By *faith* we understand a firm and unhesitating adherence to the doctrines *manifested by divine revelation*; an adherence so firm that it excludes the least doubt, or the shadow of a doubt. No moral certainty (as Mr. Tottenham seemed to think) no moral certainty is sufficient to establish a doctrine of faith. Divine faith not only excludes all doubt; but, moreover, must be grounded upon a clear apprehension of divine revelation. Mr. Lyons has said something about divisions in the Catholic Church between the Jesuits and Jangenists. I believe, Sir, (addressing Mr. Lyons) you said the *Jangenists*. (Mr. Lyons replied in the affirmative.) Who these were, (Mr. Brown continued) I should like to know, for there never was, that I heard of, a sect bearing the name of *Jangenists*; neither was the sect, *called Jansenists*, (which is their proper name) Catholics. They were as little Catholics as Baptists or Methodists, You see to what arguments our opponents have had recourse.

Mr. Tottenham is still dissatisfied with *the sweeping answers* I gave to his quotations from Scripture. I adhere to those answers, because I am convinced that when you come privately to look over the report, you will find that not a single objected text bears on the point in dispute; that not a single one of them serves to establish that the *whole of the revelations which were manifested by Christ*, and which were to be handed down to future ages, are contained in Scripture.

I have gone through all that appeared to me on the part of Mr. Tottenham, to be of weight against my arguments. A great deal has since been said by the gentleman who took his place, Mr. Lyons. Really I am convinced that Mr. T. is dissatisfied; he must be dissatisfied with the line of argument adopted by his friend. I am convinced that every one present must feel that his premises were irrevelant, and his conclusions childish. He must have come unprepared, or he never would have mixed up Jangenists, or Jansenists, or whatever he pleases to call them, with Catholics.

I will now go on with the course of argument which I was pursuing yesterday, when the meeting broke up. It was meant to establish not only that tradition, as communicated by the Apostle, was one of the means proposed

for handing down the doctrines of revelation, but also that measures were adopted by him whereby tradition was to be passed down to coming times. In proof thereof, to the texts of Scripture already adduced, I beg to add the 2 Tim. ii. 2,

“And the things thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.”

Here we have the Apostle, not only speaking of traditions which *he himself orally communicated*, but also prescribing to Timothy the means whereby these traditions *were to be handed down by him to future ages*. There is no insinuation that the Apostle designed that his oral traditions should be committed hereafter to writing by any inspired penman; on the contrary, the text clearly implies that the doctrines which he delivered to Timothy “among many witnesses,” should not be committed to writing either by Paul himself, or any other Apostle or inspired disciple; for he tells him that he must “commit them to *faithful men* who should be able *to teach others also*.” Corroborative of this is the exposition which is given by able Protestant commentators, who so far forget themselves as to be oftentimes the advocates of Catholic doctrines, when they are not actually combating our tenets. Dr. Adam Clarke, commenting on this text, speaks in these words:—

“When the Apostle laid his hands upon Timothy, he gave him the proper form of sound words which he was to teach; and now he tells him to commit those truths to faithful men, *in the same way that they were committed to him, that the truth might be preserved in the Church.*”

Mr. T. will tell me that he regards not what other Protestants may say. But I maintain that he is bound to regard them; as those Protestants, when they are not combating Catholics, but *when they weigh with deliberation the evidence of truth, discover the necessity of adhering to tradition*, as well as of receiving the written word *for the Rule of Faith*. Doddridge expounds the same text thus:—

“The things which thou hast heard of me, these commit to faithful men who may be able also to teach others, *that so there may be through all ages, a succession of such who may deliver them down from one to another, even till the end of time.*”

Here, again, the principle of tradition is manifestly held by a Protestant, and an able Protestant, in his exposition of the duties of those faithful guardians, to whom, according to the Apostle, the form of sound words was to be orally delivered, and who were in a like manner to teach others also.

In confirmation of tradition I might here refer to many

other Protestants that have commended in the highest terms, the Fathers of the Church, who from time to time handed down, by their writings, the doctrines received from their predecessors. Dr. Mills, in his dedicatory epistle prefixed to his edition of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, calls the fathers—

“*Testes integerrimæ fidei semel Sanctis traditæ, fidissimosque interpretes eloquiorum Dei.*” “Witnesses of the most sound faith once delivered to the Saints, and most faithful interpreters of the oracles of God.”

Cave in his *Appendice Historiæ Litterariæ*, tom. 2, says :—

“*Veneramur Patres, non tanquam fidei judices, sed testes, qui quodvis sæculo (suo) gestum creditumve sit, nobis fideliter exponunt. Sacrum fidei depositum ad nos transmittunt.*” “We venerate the Fathers, not as judges of the faith, but as witnesses, who faithfully set forth to us, whatsoever was done or believed in their times. *They transmit to us the sacred deposit of faith.*”

Hence Protestants, in their controversies with one another, appeal continually to the doctrines of antiquity and the fathers. Dr. Jeremy Taylor, in his work “*Episcopacy Asserted*,” not being able to convict the Presbyterians, except by the authority of the fathers, quotes tradition as confidently as a Catholic can do, and rests upon tradition the doctrine of Episcopacy as a divine institution. A more celebrated champion of Protestantism even than he, Bishop Jewel, in a sermon at St. Paul’s Cross, appealed to the traditions of the fathers; and he was so rash as to declare that if a single clear text from the fathers could be produced to prove that for the first 600 years there had been any private mass, he himself would become a Catholic. He was convicted, therefore, in an appeal made to the doctrines of the fathers, by Harding, Stapleton, Rastal, and others. What was the consequence? We have the assurance of Dr. Smith, not many years after the death of Jewel, (on the authority of a Physician, Dr. Twin, who received the information from the chaplain of Bishop Jewel), that on his death-bed he declared that *all the time he professed to be the enemy of Catholic doctrines, and combated them, he was in heart a Catholic*. This fact Dr. Twin communicated to two Catholic noblemen, from whom Dr. Smith received the information, and who, when it was announced by him to the world were all alive; nor did Dr. Twin or those two noblemen ever contradict this declaration.

I now come to my third position, that Protestants themselves in practice do not admit the Scripture as the *sole Rule of Faith*. Few doctrines have been more railed at

than the doctrine of tradition. What then will be the result upon your minds, if I am able to make it out *that you yourselves, for many essential doctrines of your faith, rely upon no other grounds than the authority of tradition?*

The 6th article of the 39 in the Book of Common Prayer, declares: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to Salvation; so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed *as an article of faith.*" Now let me invite your attention to the subsequent words of this same article;—"In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority *was never any doubt in the Church.*" Do you not perceive the inconsistency of this article? It begins by declaring that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man to be believed *as an article of faith.*" I ask you, therefore, *do you not believe* those books which constitute your Canon of Scripture to belong thereto? Is not your belief in the canonicity of those books *an article of faith?* I shall be told, probably, that it is a matter of historical tradition: such is the answer which has been heretofore given. That certain books belong to the Canon of Scripture is a matter of *historical tradition*, as regards the *manner only* in which that fact comes down to us. But is *the fact itself* a matter merely of *historical* tradition? Do you believe only by *historical faith* that the books contained in the Canon of Scripture are truly a part of divine revelation, and truly appertaining to the sacred canon? No; you will not affirm that *this* is only a matter of *historical* belief; you all hold it as a point of divine *faith*. If *you* do not, there are at least *eminent Protestants* who do so hold it. I have now in my hand a book which was given me by an anonymous friend after the discussion at Cheltenham, with a hope that this book would bring about my conversion to the Protestant creed. I have read it with great attention, and have found it so far useful as it shows that Protestants of the Church of England are divided upon several important matters of *faith*, in spite of what has been said to the contrary. Its title is "*On the Genuineness and Authenticity of the New Testament,*" by Robert Haldane, a member, I believe, of the Reformation Society.

“ While it has been denied (he writes, p. 78,) that the question of the canon is a point of revelation ; it has been asserted that it is a point of erudition. But *erudition has nothing further to do with the question*, than as it may be employed in conveying to us the testimony. . . . We receive the canon of Scripture by revelation in the same way that the Jews received the law which was given on Mount Sinai. . . . Christians in their successive generations, *receive the canon of Scripture as a matter of revelation.*” . . . . . Page 79. “ As far as the genuineness and authenticity of any book are brought into suspicion, so far is every thing contained in it brought into suspicion. For it should always be remembered, that there is no greater absurdity than to question the claim of a book to a place in the canon, and at the same time to acknowledge its contents to be a revelation from God. There can be no evidence that the doctrines of Scripture are revealed truths, unless we are certain that the books of Scripture are revelation. *If the books which compose the canon are not revelation, then we have no revelation.* If the truth of the canon be not established to us *as a matter of revelation*, the books of which it is composed are not so established ; and if the books be not so, then not one sentence of them, nor one doctrine or precept which they contain, comes established to us *as a revelation.*”

It is therefore manifest that your belief on this point is, or ought to be, not a matter of mere *historical belief*, but of *divine faith*.

Whence, then, do you derive your belief in your own Canon of Scripture? Not from any declaration in the written word ; for your own 6th Article affirms—

“ In the name of the Holy Scripture, we do understand those *canonical books, &c.* of whose authority *was never any doubt in the Church.*”

It is therefore upon *the authority of the Church*, that authority which you affect to slight upon other occasions, and upon the authority of *tradition*, that you ground your belief of the canonicity of the books in your own Bible. Many eminent Protestants admit this most distinctly ; but I will quote only two or three, for I do not wish to waste time, and Mr. Tottenham is unwilling to admit the evidence of Protestants. Archbishop Wake, in his “ Commentary on the Catechism of the Church of England,” p. 22, 23, writes thus :—

“ How do ye know what books were written by these persons, the Prophets, Evangelists and Apostles? *Answer.*—“ *By the constant universal testimony, both of the Jewish and Christian Churches ; from the former of which we have received the Scriptures of the Old, from the latter those of the New Testament.*”

Chillingworth, in his “ Religion of Protestants,” cap. ii. No. 27, says :—

“ The question whether such or such a book be Canonical Scripture, though it may be decided *negatively* out of Scripture, by showing apparent and irreconcilable contradictions between it and some other books, confessedly canonical, yet *affirmatively* it cannot be decided, but only by the testimony of the *ancient Churches.*”

A living Protestant authority, Bishop Walker, in his



“ Serious Expostulation with the Rev. Henry Craig,” observes—

“ Even if you should deem me an absolute Papist, I will yet maintain that *her (the Church of Rome's) testimony is essential* in the successive links of evidence by which *we ascertain the authenticity of Scripture*, and make up with certainty the evidence of that faith once delivered to the saints.”

Here are eminent Protestants, surely as deserving of credit as Mr. T., who are not able to prove the *canonicity of the Scriptures, except by the authority of tradition* ; and the declaration of your own Common Prayer Book appeals to *tradition, for the canonicity of the sacred volume*. There is Haldane, moreover, maintaining that your belief in its canonicity must be a matter of *divine faith*, and not merely a matter of history or erudition.

But something still worse is, that *your application of tradition* in this place is *defective*, because you own no infallible speaking authority to which you will submit. The 6th Article goes on to state what are the books which constitute the Canon of Scripture ; and I find amongst those books, *many* of which there has been considerable *doubt in the Church*. “ All the books,” says the article, “ of the New Testament, *as they are commonly received*, we do receive, and account them as canonical.” Now I find that in the first ages, the Ebionites rejected all but the Gospel of Matthew ; the followers of Cerinthus rejected all but the Gospel of Luke ; Cerdo, Tatian, and the Manichees the Acts of the Apostles ; Marcion and his followers, the Epistles to Timothy and Titus ; others the Epistle to Philemon ; yet you admit these amongst the canonical books, of which you affirm that “ *there never was any doubt* in the Church.” Do you not see the inconsistency of your application of the rule of tradition, even where you admit it ? You will tell me, perhaps, that those whose doubts I have enumerated were heretics : but I contend that they were entitled to the appellation of Protestants ; for they made *Scripture their only Rule of Faith* ; they *protested* against the Catholic Church, and nothing more is necessary to constitute a Protestant.

Mr. Lyons said, or he seemed to say, that Unitarians were not Protestants, because they did not admit the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, But I shall soon shew you that Protestants of the Established Church do not admit the plenary inspiration of Scripture, any more than Unitarians, who are as much entitled to the appellation of Protestants as those for whom Mr. T. and Mr. L. stand forward.



Several, however, of the books of Scriptures were doubted of, not amongst heretics only, but by many of the primitive Christians. The Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of St. James, the Epistle of St. Jude, the Second Epistle of St. Peter, the Second and Third of St. John, and the Book of Revelations, were not universally admitted in the primitive Church. How know you, therefore, that these books now belong to the canon of Scripture? St. Austin, in his *Expos. inchoata* in *Epist. ad Rom.* b. 11, et l. 16 de *Civ. Dei*, c. 22, informs us that in the fifth century many denied that the Epistle to the *Hebrews* had been written by St. Paul, and *excluded it from the canon*. St. Jerome writes, in p. 129 of his Epistle to Dardanus, and in his Commentary on Isaiah, c. 8, that in his time the Epistle to the *Hebrews* was *rejected by the custom of the Western Church*. We are informed by Dionysius of Alexandria, apud Eusebium, in the 7th book of Ecclesiastical History, c. 25, that the *Apocalypse* was *repudiated by many, in the second and third centuries*, as a book without reason, and as a production of the extravagant heretic Cerinthus, written for the purpose of authorising his ravings. Thus your very rule for the application of tradition fails you, for *there were doubts* in the Church for a long while on some of those books, which you admit to be canonical.

This is not all. *There is not a single one of the canons of the early Church which admits all the books of Scripture that you admit in your canon*. Bossuet, in his letter to Leibnitz, observes, that Protestants urge against the Catholic canon—

“The canons of Melito, of Laodicea, of St. Athanasius, of the Synopsis,—of St. Gregory Nazianzen, of Amphilochius, of St. Epiphanius. But 1st the Book of Esther, received by Protestants, is not in the canon of Melito, nor of St. Athanasius (where it is classed with Wisdom, Toby, &c.), nor of the Synopsis (except as classed with Judith, &c.), nor of St. Gregory, nor of Amphilochius, as certainly canonical. 2ndly. The Council of Laodicea admits as canonical Baruch and Jeremy’s Epistle, and not the Apocalypse; the Synopsis also admits Baruch—St. Gregory rejects, besides Esther, the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse—Amphilochius remarks that some reject the Epistle to the Hebrews, and most the Apocalypse—finally, St. Epiphanius, who in his book on weights and measures had proposed the canon of the Jews—afterwards, on the 76th heresy, numbers among the Scriptures Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus.”

You see, therefore, proofs in the very authorities to which Mr. Tottenham appealed against us, in the canons of Scripture proposed by several of the early Churches, that there was doubt, in the primitive ages, of several

books which you admit; and hence you cannot be satisfied of the canonicity of your own books of Scripture, but by having recourse to the authority as well as the traditions of the Church.

I go still farther. Besides the canonicity of the sacred books, you admit their *divine origin*; you contend that every one of the books of the New Testament as well as the Old was written *by inspiration of the Divine Spirit*. This, at least, is a *matter of divine faith amongst you*; you will not contend that this is a question *merely of historical tradition*. Now, you can have no satisfaction of the inspiration of the Scriptures, except by relying on the tradition and authority of the Catholic Church. This I prove, first, *from the variations* of Protestants, whose uncertainty respecting *the nature of inspiration* in the Scriptures, shows their incapability of proving their inspiration without having recourse to authority and tradition of the Church. First, Dr. Doddridge, who is celebrated amongst you as an expounder of the written word, in his "Family Expositor," vol. iii. p. 417, et seq., attributes the *New Testament generally* to an inspiration of mere *superintendency*, when "God keeps a person more secure from error in what he speaks and writes, than what he could have been merely by the natural exercise of his faculties." In like manner Jenkins (on the Christian Religion, vol. ii. p. 25) assigns such matters in Scripture as belong to sense, natural reason, and memory, *to the mere guidance of the Holy Ghost, and his support against error*. Many other Protestant authors maintain similar opinions. Now the inspiration of mere *superintendency* is *no inspiration at all*. It does not render that to which it is applied, *the word of God*, since it implies no communication of his language or sentiments, but only the infallible *word of man*, and hence, every act of faith founded thereon is essentially *an act of human, not of divine faith*, which can be established on no other testimony than that of God.

The degradation to which the inspired writings are subjected by Protestant divines does not end here. Doddridge, in the same 3rd vol. of his Family Expositor, p. 437, after citing a portion of one of Seed's sermons, in which he argues that

"A partial inspiration is, to all intents and purposes, no inspiration at all; for mankind would be as much embarrassed to know what was inspired, and what not, as they could be to collect a religion for themselves, the consequences of which would be, that we are just left where we were, and that God put himself to a great expense of miracles to effect nothing at all;"

very soon after citing those words, Dr. D., by a glaring inconsistency, falls into the very error which Seed reprove, and says ;

“ I leave other objections to be answered by those, *if any such there be*, who imagine that Paul would need an immediate revelation from Heaven, and a miraculous dictate of the Holy Ghost, to remind Timothy of his cloak and writings which he left at Troas, or to advise him to mingle a little wine with his water”!!

Here look at the inconsistency of Protestants. They first reject tradition from being a portion of the rule of faith, and confine themselves to Scripture only ; then, when they come to the application of this their only rule, they are obliged at one time to have recourse to the traditions of the Church ; at another, rejecting tradition, they reject also the inspiration of Scripture : so we here find Doddridge rejecting a portion of Scripture from inspiration.

I quote next, to the same effect, the authority of a Bishop of the Protestant Church, Dr. Prettyman, who, in his *Elements of Christian Theology*, vol. i. p. 7 (a work much extolled by Protestants, and put into the hands of those who are preparing for holy orders), writes thus :—

“ The authors of the books of Scripture were sometimes left to the common use of their faculties, and did not on every occasion stand in need of supernatural communication ; but whenever, and as far as divine assistance was necessary, it was always afforded.”

Who is it now that treats with irreverence the divine word ? Is it the Catholic, who maintains that every portion was inspired ? Is it the Catholic, who rejects every doctrine, come whence it will, that is contrary to the inspired word of God ? Or does not he rather refuse due reverence to the sacred Scripture, who rejects whole portions, as Dr. Doddridge does, and maintains with Prettyman that inspiration was not given *for the whole*, but only “ so far as divine assistance was necessary ?” In p. 27, the Bishop inquires by what rule you may determine what parts were inspired and what were not.

“ If it be asked, by what rule we are to distinguish the inspired from the *uninspired parts* of these books, I answer, that *no general rule can be prescribed* for that purpose. It is enough for us to know that every writer of the Old Testament was inspired, and that the whole of the history it contains, without any exception or reserve, is true.”

Here is a sad confusion of inspiration with simple preservation from error.

“ These points being ascertained and allowed, it is of very little consequence whether the knowledge of a particular fact was obtained by any of the ordinary modes of information, or whether it was communicated by immediate revela-

tion from God; whether *any particular passage was written by the natural powers of the historian*, or whether it was written by the positive suggestion of the Holy Spirit."

It is of very little consequence whether what constitutes a great portion of the Scriptures were inspired, or whether it were written after the manner of a history, and by the *natural powers* of the historian!! This is a Protestant Doctor, a Protestant Bishop, writing in a work which is put into the hands of those who are preparing for holy orders in the Protestant Church.

He continues—

"We may, in like manner, suppose that *some of the precepts* delivered in the books called *Hagiographa*" (which include Ruth, Chronicles, Esdras, Esther, Job, the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and Daniel), "*were written without any supernatural assistance.*"

Bishop P. afterwards approves of a tract of a Mr. Wm. Parry, from which he cites, in p. 291, the following words:—

"If the inspiration and guidance of the Spirit, respecting the writers of the New Testament, extended only to what appears to be *its proper province, matters of a religious and moral nature*, then there is no necessity to ask *whether every thing*, contained in their writings, were suggested immediately by the Spirit or not; whether Luke were inspired to say, that the ship in which he sailed with Paul was wrecked on the Island of Melito; or, whether Paul were *under the guidance of the Spirit*, in directing Timothy to bring with him the cloak, which he left at Troas, and the books, but especially the parchments; for the answer is obvious—*these were not things of a religious nature, and no inspiration was necessary concerning them.*"

Here again is an admission on the part of another Protestant divine that inspiration is unnecessary for some portions of Scripture. Whence comes it? Because Protestants are not able, *adhering to their principles*, to prove the inspiration of the whole of Scripture by any certain and conclusive arguments, still less can they establish it as a *matter of divine faith*.

There are other Protestant theologians who go farther. I pass over most of them; but I cannot help calling attention to what is advanced by Dr. Grier, in his Reply to the End of Religious Controversy, ch. i. p. 9:—

"To pronounce *with confidence what books of the canon, or parts of books, are inspired, and what not*, belongs not certainly to a member of the Church of England. So that when he (Bishop Milner) asks how we learned what books have been written by divine inspiration, or how we have ascertained that any books at all, have been so written, we may answer, that where the Holy Scriptures declare that they set forth a divine revelation, or that they express the word of God, we believe them to do so. BUT AS TO THE FACT OF THEIR INSPIRATION, WE MUST, WITH AWE AND MODESTY, HUMBLY DECLINE TO SAY, WHAT WE BELIEVE NO CHURCH, ANCIENT OR MODERN, CAN EVER ATTEST."

It is a Protestant clergyman, high in the estimation of

Protestants, who writes, “as to the fact of inspiration of the books of Scripture, we must with awe and modesty humbly decline to say what we believe no Church, ancient or modern, can ever attest.” Surely this is sufficient to convince you that *you must borrow several articles of belief from tradition*, or you will be thrown into difficulties that I tremble to contemplate. You will have to cast overboard much of the Scriptures, and the inspiration of the greater part. The arguments which the champions of Protestantism can adduce, do not prove the inspiration of the larger portion of the New Testament. They may be able to prove that Scripture is genuine, and that Scripture is authentic; but this is far beneath the point they are bound to establish; for they are bound to show by Scripture itself, that *the whole of Scripture*, not a portion, not two portions, not this book or that, but that *the whole* is inspired, and the word of God himself.

I would pass on to another argument, but I have not time now. Again, I repeat this to you:—How are you satisfied of the canonicity of the books of the New Testament? How are you satisfied of the inspiration of Scripture? I require from the Gentlemen opposite a clear and positive answer; and I am confident that when that answer is before you, you will be convinced that, unless you have recourse to tradition, you must give up a portion of the canonical books, and the inspiration of the greater part.

Here is another proof in point. You admit the 8th chapter of John, wherein is contained the history of the woman taken in adultery. This portion, it is well known, was omitted in a great number of Greek MSS.; it is omitted by Origen and Chrysostom; it is not found in the Greek Catena, which contains 23 Greek authors; the very first commentator who mentioned it was Euthymius, in the twelfth century, and even he says it was not found in the most correct copies; it was not contained in the Coptic, Gothic, or Syriac versions, before the publication of the English Polyglot; it was doubted of by many Catholics before the Council of Trent, and by many Protestants before and since. Now what proof have you, such especially as to make it a matter of *divine faith*, that this 8th chapter of the Gospel of John truly belongs to the canon of Scripture, and is truly an inspired portion thereof? What proof is there that rests not exclusively on *tradition*? By what other evidence is this chapter received, and the

history of Susannah, or Baruch, rejected? There is an apparent obscurity in this matter, and therefore there must be, moreover, some *authority* to determine, in such cases wherein traditions are not clear, what were the real doctrines communicated from faithful men to faithful men down to our own times;—what parts of obscure traditions are to be received as genuine, what are not to be received as such, because the former do, and the latter do not manifest *the doctrines of the unerring Church*, at the times to which the writers refer.

---

THE CHAIRMAN.

Ladies and Gentlemen,—You will pardon my rising to anticipate a reply to the personalities in which the last speaker has indulged.

I am sure that I best interpret your feelings, and most promote the objects of this Discussion, whilst expressing a hope that it should be conducted without having recourse to personal allusions, whether to pronunciation or otherwise.

THE REV. E. TOTTENHAM.

Mr. Chairman,—In conformity with the observations you have just made, even were I not to consult my own feelings, I should certainly abstain from any thing like personal allusion.

Mr. Macdonnell, in his opening speech, did me the honour to pay me a compliment; however, he did not apply it in the most complimentary manner. He told me I exercised any power which I possessed in carefully slipping away from the subject, and that that had been uniformly my practice. Now I really think Mr. Macdonnell ought himself to have attended to the substance of this remark in his own speech. I find him speaking a great deal occasionally of what he calls the Law Church, and of a well paid ministry; I behold him drawing a frightful picture of the state of Ireland, and of other places; and speaking of the Reformation Society as introduced to supersede the instruction of bishops and ministers. These and other

such topics he has introduced. I ask, therefore, if all this was, or was not, slipping away from the question? If I was guilty of the error, I think the blame lies upon the Rev. Gentleman himself as well as upon me.

Though my friend on the right has replied to the statements made by the Rev. Mr. Macdonnell, yet there are a few points which I wish to notice, inasmuch as he had not time to follow them out fully, and particularly because some of them refer more immediately to myself.

Mr. Macdonnell asserted that it was imperatively required that I should have proved the sufficiency of my own rule of faith, whereas the fact was that I was doing nothing but *retorting* on the Roman Catholic rule. Let our friends judge whether I have not attempted to prove the one as well as to retort on the other; and let me say, that, if I retorted, it was not so much for the purpose of formally attacking the Roman Catholic rule, as of shewing *that the arguments urged against the Protestant rule proved too much*, and were consequently of no avail. Retort has often been considered a most powerful kind of argument, and perhaps this may account for Mr. Macdonnell's uneasiness on the subject.

The Rev. Gentleman has asked this question:—"Is there any place in Christ's teaching, or in that of the Apostles', in which it is said the Bible was to be the only rule of faith?" And then he adds,—“If it was *intended* to be such, *Christ ought to have so taught us.*” On this latter point I shall make the same observation that I did yesterday—I have nothing to say to what Christ ought or ought not to have done; I am satisfied that he should do what he pleases, without being guilty of the presumption of *prescribing* a particular course of proceeding to a Being like him.

To return, however, to the original question. We are asked,—“Is there any place where Christ or his apostles distinctly teach that the Bible was to be the only rule of faith?” Suppose it were not taught *in so many words*, would it therefore follow that the written word does not contain all things necessary to salvation? It would not; for when we know that the Scriptures have come from God, we have a right to *assume* that they are perfect, and contain all necessary truth, till the contrary be proved, or till an additional rule be adduced and authenticated as being of divine origin. But let me say, though *the very words*, “the Bible only,” are not to be found in Christ's



teaching, yet no argument can be founded on this, for several passages have been quoted which are *equivalent* to such an expression, and prove decisively the sufficiency and supreme authority of the Scriptures alone as a rule of faith. Out of the many that I produced I may notice particularly the one in the Second Epistle to Timothy, 3rd chap. ver. 14—17. This proves my point distinctly; for, if the Scriptures are able to make a man “*wise unto salvation*,” certainly there must be within them every thing necessary for us to know. Let me further observe, that *there has not been even an attempt, from the opening of the discussion to the present moment, to reply to that text of Scripture.*

We have again and again had the argument about the books of the New Testament not having been written in the first instance; but that I have already answered, and I need not go over the ground again. Let the public judge of the correctness or the incorrectness of the answer from the printed report.

The Rev. Gentleman from Birmingham talked about translations, and he said that the Bible, which had been circulated in this kingdom, was notoriously corrupt. My friend, Mr. Lyons, has adverted to this subject, and has used the method of *retort*, perhaps not to the satisfaction of our friends on the other side. The question, Sir, we are debating, is not about translations, but respecting the Scriptures as God has given them; and though it may happen that, in this or that translation, there may be occasional errors, yet it does not follow that the revelation, as it came from God, should be insufficient as a rule of faith.

However, with respect to that translation with which we are most concerned, and which, I suppose, is the one alluded to, namely, that which is called King James's Bible; I should say, that the circumstances under which it was translated were such as to preclude the possibility of any vital error. The circumstances of the case were these. About 50 divines were brought together, who, as a Roman Catholic bishop, Dr. Milner, says, were “*of various capacities, learning, judgment, opinions, and prejudices.*” The plan upon which they proceeded was this. Each divine took a single book of Scripture, or a portion, and translated it, after which it was submitted to the other divines; so that each part was first translated by an individual, and then passed round to be revised and sanctioned

by the whole number. Now, if the men engaged in the work were, as Dr. Milner says, “of various capacities, learning, judgment, opinions, and prejudices,” it is impossible that they could have united in setting forth a wilfully corrupt translation, seeing that each must have been a check on the others. Moreover, Dr. Doyle himself declared, in his examination before the Parliamentary Commissioners, that the authorised version was a NOBLE WORK.

In addition to this—there is another important point to be borne in mind in connection with the question of translations. There was the Septuagint in existence in our Lord’s time. This translation was certainly not immaculate. Horne, in his “Introduction to the Critical Study of the Scriptures,” demonstrates its incorrectness in many places in reference to the Hebrew text; and yet we find that our Lord and his Apostles constantly quoted from it, as well as from the Hebrew. This fact shows us that we may be satisfied with a translation, though it be not *altogether* so correct as the original. So far for the question of translations.

The old objection, in reference to Unitarians, was here started. It was asked how we could satisfy an Unitarian with respect to the text, “My Father is greater than I;” and much inconsistency was charged on us for violating, by the attempt, our principle of the right of private judgment. Before stating the answer we should give to an Unitarian under such circumstances, let me reply to the charge of inconsistency, by saying, as I did before, that until it could be proved that we sought to *force* his judgment, it could not fairly be proved that we acted inconsistently with our principles. We hold private judgment to be a *natural right*, and therefore applicable to *religion*, until it be established that, as respects *it*, there is a *special limitation*. Believing this, and believing at the same time that a simple Unitarian is in error, we go to him, *not to force* his judgment, but to lead him to exercise it more seriously and prayerfully, and with greater submission to the plain testimony of the Bible. Thus we are guilty of no inconsistency. Now, with respect to the objection itself. The difficulty started by the Unitarian is this:—Christ says, “My Father is greater than I;” and therefore the Unitarian concludes that Christ is not God. I should say to him in reply, that his conclusion is too hastily drawn, because, if he examines the Scriptures, he

will find many passages that assert the Son's *equality* with the Father, in just as positive terms as this text asserts his *inferiority*. There are many passages which assert his Deity,—and there are many passages that assert his humanity. Is not then the most legitimate mode of interpretation that which applies all texts that speak of *inferiority* to his *human* nature, and all texts that speak of *equality* to his *divine*? If this method be *not* adopted, we must positively *sacrifice altogether* either the texts on the side of his equality, or on that of his inferiority, whereas *by it we preserve both in perfect harmony*. The Unitarian is compelled to fritter and explain away all the former,—the Trinitarian admits and contends for the strength and application of both former and latter. On this principle there is no difficulty in the passage, “My Father is greater than I.” Christ spoke of himself here *in his human nature*, while in *other* places he contended for his *equality* with the Father. He was therefore “*equal to the Father as touching his Godhead, and inferior to the Father as touching his manhood.*” Here is the substance of the solution I should give to this supposed difficulty; and however unwilling the Unitarian might sometimes be to receive it, I am persuaded it would do much more to *satisfy* him than the exertion, on the part of the Church of Rome, of an *authority* which he disbelieves and disregards. To what I have thus stated, let me add, by way of corroboration, that Hilary, in the 4th century, wrote 12 books on the Trinity, and in those books he proved the Deity of Christ *simply from texts of Scripture*. He referred not to the authority of the Church, but to Scripture, as the reason for believing the doctrine, and *he answered the very objection started on the other side, precisely in the way that I have now answered it.*

With reference to the passages from the 9th and 10th of Acts, my friend has answered them fully; and I may state, moreover, that, even if Mr. Macdonnell were substantially correct in his assertion that Peter was the instructor of Cornelius, for the purpose of leading him into an acknowledgment of the *very first principles* of true religion, this would prove nothing against us, inasmuch as I before asserted that the rule of faith, during the personal ministry of the Apostles, was the *Old Testament Scriptures, together with their oral teaching*. I added, however (and gave proofs on the subject), that, before they passed from the stage of life, they *committed the substantial and neces-*

*sary truths of this oral teaching to writing, that it, with the Old Testament, might form the rule for future generations.*

Mr. Macdonnell referred to several texts, and to the conduct of parents, ministers, &c.; as if he wanted to shew that we were inconsistent in holding the Bible to be the only rule of faith, while we gave instructions, and used catechisms, and so forth. There is, however, no inconsistency here at all. We certainly do not deny the value and importance of instruction; nay, we contend for it constantly: but it is one thing that ministers, parents, and catechisms should be made the means of calling the attention of individuals to the truths which are in Scripture, or even of commenting on those truths: and it is quite a different thing that they should constitute the rule itself. They are only the means to direct to the rule, —while the Bible is still the standard of appeal.

We were inconsistent also, it was said, *in holding the 39 Articles*, if we believe the Bible to be the *sole* rule of faith. I am sure Mr. Macdonnell must know that we do not hold the 39 Articles *as a rule of faith*. He ought to distinguish between a *rule*, and a *confession*, of faith. We hold the Bible to be the rule, and the 39 Articles we regard as the expression, of our belief. The difference between the two things is quite manifest.

I come now to the observations which Mr. Brown has made. He says that he should not have objected to my having opposed the Roman Catholic rule, if I had not *almost altogether confined myself to it*. I appeal to those whom I address, whether I have done as my opponent says, or whether I have not sought to establish, by a long list of Scripture texts (only two of which have yet been noticed), the authority and sufficiency of the Protestant rule. I ask too, if all my retorts, which have been so much objected to, were not directed rather to prove that the arguments against the Protestant rule (as coming from a member of the Church of Rome) *went too far*, than immediately and primarily to attack the Roman Catholic rule.

Mr. Brown says, with respect to the passage from the 1st of Corinthians, the 11th chap. and 34th verse, “*The rest I will set in order when I come*”—that I have not shewn that the things of which the Apostle speaks *did not regard faith*. As I have already commented at large on this passage, I shall content myself here with remarking, that, whether I *have* shewn what my opponent requires,

or not, I am not strictly under the *necessity* of doing so. For, in an argument like this, the onus rests on *him* to prove the *affirmative*—that they *did* regard faith—rather than on *me* to prove the *negative*—that they did *not* regard faith.

The 20th chap. of St. John, verses 30 and 31, have been once more introduced, and my adversary affirms, that the things which, in the 31st verse, the Evangelist says were “written,” *refer to the miracles which had been previously recorded*. Without occupying my time on this point, it is quite sufficient for me to observe, that he has not *proved* this. He has merely *asserted* it on the individual testimony of one who, though a Protestant, was not infallible—I mean Dr. Clarke. I enter not into the question whether the Doctor was right or wrong in his opinion, but I say that Mr. Brown is under the necessity of *proving the point positively* before he derives an argument from it.

I am told that I have mistaken the question all along. My opponent says, he does not dispute the fact that the Apostles committed to writing what they before orally delivered; but he tells us the question really is, did they commit to writing *all* the truths they thus delivered? I grant they may not have done so with respect to every syllable that they taught, but I contend that they *did* commit to writing *all essential truth*, and if they omitted any thing, I maintain that *the very fact of the omission proves that the thing omitted was not essential*. We are told indeed (by a strong figure), relative to what Christ both did and said, that, if all were written, the whole “world would not contain the books which should be written;”—*I marvel then if the Church of Rome has got them all in tradition?*

Regarding the Epistle of Jude, when I remarked on the prophecy of Enoch being communicated to him *by inspiration*, Mr. Brown said that this was a gratuitous assertion. I cannot agree with him in this, because, *unless we limit the extent of Divine inspiration*, we must suppose that God would communicate to the minds of those, who wrote the different books, certain facts that had occurred, and prophecies that had been delivered in by-gone times, though the memory of them might long since have been forgotten. We are under the necessity of admitting this fact with regard to many things recorded in the historical books.

In my last speech I cited a passage from Bellarmine, in order to show that there was no “unanimous consent” among the Fathers in the interpretation of Scripture.

This passage has been adverted to by my Rev. opponent, and he says, that, in order to establish my point, I ought to have proved that the Fathers were divided upon points of doctrine, and not upon the meaning of texts; for he affirmed that it was *only* in reference to points of *doctrine* that the unanimous consent of the Fathers was required. I say, however, that his Church *goes farther* on this subject than Mr. Brown has asserted. I hold in my hand a document, the authority of which will not be disputed: it is the Creed of Pope Pius the 4th, and I quote from it as follows:—

“ I also admit the Holy Scriptures according to that sense which our holy mother, the Church, has held, and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures: *nor will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.*”

In this article a Roman Catholic makes a profession not merely that he will not receive *doctrines* except “ according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers,” but that *he will not interpret Scripture* except in the same way. I should like, therefore, to hear where this unanimous consent is to be found? I have given a remarkable instance of the *want* of it. I have shown you that the Fathers are far from unanimous on one of the most important texts on which several of the most distinguished divines of the Church of Rome found the doctrine of Purgatory.

As to the divisions among Roman Catholics, which had been mentioned, Mr. Brown says that none of them apply to matters of faith, but that they are upon points of minor consequence. We were told, however, yesterday, as a matter of *great consequence*, that Protestants differed on *grace* and *justification*; and it is sufficient for my purpose at present to remind you that I yesterday showed that *members of the Church of Rome differed on these very points*. The two individuals, Soto and Vega, who wrote books on the decrees of the Council of Trent, with reference to those subjects, *took diametrically opposite views*: so that my adversary’s statement regarding Protestants recoils with equal force upon his own Church.

But is it a fact that Roman Catholics do not differ upon *other* points of importance also? Is not *the means of agreement* a matter of importance? Now what is the professed means of agreement in the Church of Rome? It is the supposed existence of an infallible authority vested in the Church. I maintain, however, that *there is a differ-*



ence of opinion up to the present day respecting this point ; some declare that the authority of a Pope is above that of a Council, and others that the authority of a Council is above that of a Pope. On this subject let us listen to the statement of the eminent Roman Catholic barrister and controversialist, Charles Butler, of whom we have heard much. In his "Book of the Roman Catholic Church," the matter is stated thus, in the 10th Letter, page 122.

"In spiritual concerns, the *Transalpine* opinions ascribe to the Pope *a superiority and controlling power over the whole Church*, should she chance to oppose his decrees, and consequently, *over a general council*, her representative. . . . They likewise ascribe to the Pope the extraordinary prerogative of *personal infallibility*, when he undertakes to issue a solemn decision on any point of faith. The *Cisalpin*es affirm, that in spirituals *the Pope is subject*, in doctrine and discipline, *to the Church*, and *to a general council* representing her. . . . They affirm, that a general council may, without, and even against the Pope's consent, reform the Church. They *deny his personal infallibility*, and hold that he may be *deposed* by the Church, or a general council, for heresy and schism."

Dr. De La Hogue, in his "Treatise on the Church," (which is the class-book at the Roman Catholic College at Maynooth) speaks as follows :

"Moreover, the matter stands thus with regard to the article on the respective authority of general councils and the Roman Pontiff, *which the Ultra-montanists*, (i. e. the Italians) *and the French declare to have been defined in a wholly contrary sense, the one party by the Council of Constance, the other by the 5th Council of Lateran*. The Ultra-montanists *deny the œcumenicity of the Council of Constance* in respect of its 4th and 5th sessions, in which the Canons concerning the authority of general councils above the Roman Pontiff were compiled, and restrict the meaning of those canons to the time either of schism or of a doubtful Pope : and in truth this was the question on account of which that Council was assembled. The French, on the other hand, *deny*, and not without strong arguments, *the œcumenicity of the Council of Lateran*, which was assembled at a very cloudy season, when an unhappy war raged between Julius the 2nd, and the Most Christian King of France, and which only a few bishops could attend, and scarcely any from the provinces of France. Now, in this celebrated controversy between the Ultra-montanists and the French, THE CHURCH HAS THOUGHT FIT TO GIVE NO DECISION (!) as appears from the acts of the Council of Trent, to which we shall refer in our article on the Pope's prerogatives."—Tractat. de Eccles. Autor. L. Æ. Delahogue. Edit. tert. p. 50.

And again :—

"The Ultra-montane Theologians *ascribe infallibility to the Pope*, when regarded in this last point of view, and speaking, as they say, *ex cathedra*, which opinion others, and more particularly the French, *oppose*."—Id. p. 385.

Here we find, upon the testimony of De La Hogue and Charles Butler, (and I might give you a long chain of additional evidence from different sources of authority on the subject) that Roman Catholics are *divided as to the precise seat where infallibility exists*. This, be it observed, is a division of *the greatest possible moment*, because Roman Catholics cannot make a proper use of the alleged in-



fallibility of their Church, till they discover to a certainty *what is the place of its habitation.*

Then again—with regard to *Councils*—there is a *difference of opinion* as to what constitutes a council *universal*. *Three opinions* exist in the Church of Rome on that subject, each of which has been adopted by some of the greatest men who have ever lived in her communion. But even suppose this point were settled, there is *another difference of opinion* as to what constitutes the *legality* of a Council. There are several points, namely, Papal convocation, presidency, and confirmation; members, freedom of discussion, and unanimity of decision: and respecting all these points there has been more or less difference of opinion. This I could shew you, by a long array of evidence, did time permit, and shall, if called upon to do so. Here are *differences upon points of essential consequence*, because they lie at the foundation or ground-work of the whole system of the Church of Rome. If, therefore, my opponent's argument respecting the differences of Protestants, on the *extent* of inspiration or any other point, be good for any thing, I contend that my arguments regarding the differences in the Church of Rome apply with at least equal force against his Church. I shall not advert further to these divisions, though I have a long list here which I can produce, if necessary.

Mr. Brown, among other things, advanced some extraordinary statements relative to the celebrated Bishop Jewel. I think he gave the authority of Smith, bishop of Chalcedon, and on this testimony he stated, that, previous to his death, Jewel had declared, that *all which he had written against Roman Catholic doctrines had been against his conscience, and for the purpose of pleasing the Queen.* Now the Bishop of Aire, before Mr. Brown, has taken advantage of this testimony in his "Discussion Amicale;" and I shall read a brief but pointed answer given to the statement from Faber's "Difficulties of Romanism," which was written in reply to the bishop's work:

"Thus condescends the respectable Bishop of Aire to calumniate an English prelate, on the testimony of a man, who published his pretended facts, not in the reign of Elizabeth, and in England, but in the year 1654, and at Paris: thus condescends the bishop to mislead an English layman, forgetting, or ignorant, that this very Jewel, ~~before~~ *before the accession of Elizabeth*, and *during the reign of her sister*, had been ejected from all his preferment for his stout adherence to the primitive Catholic faith, and had himself escaped the flames, only, by a timely flight to the Continent."—Diff. of Rom. by Geo. Stanley Faber, B.D. p. 151. Lond. 1826.

So far for the statement relative to Bishop Jewel, and in reply to this grievous charge upon the principles and conduct of a man, who wielded the weapons of the Bible so powerfully against the Church of Rome; and who (let me say, notwithstanding what was asserted on the other side) wielded also the testimony of the Fathers against the doctrines of that church with power and with effect.

My Reverend opponent next passed to a point upon which I shall chiefly occupy myself for the rest of my time. He attempted to show that Protestants deny their rule in practice. For this purpose he adverted to the Sixth Article of the Church of England, in which it is said, that *all necessary things are contained in Scripture*. He then argues:—"How can that be? It is inconsistent on the part of Protestants to make that assertion, when Scripture *itself* cannot be proved from Scripture, and yet the belief of it is necessary to salvation." This objection proceeds from a mistake. We never affirmed that Scripture is *the object* of faith. We contend that Scripture, *being itself received upon certain EVIDENCE*, is the *means* of faith, *not the object* of it; and, if this distinction be kept in mind, the present objection falls to the ground.

It was alleged, moreover, that there was an inconsistency in the Article of the Church of England, which says—"In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, *of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church*,"—whereas it was a fact, that there were some of them concerning which doubts *did*, at different times, exist. Now let me tell the Reverend Gentleman that the meaning of the article is this:—The Church of England does not intend to say that there was never any doubt, respecting some of the books she receives as canonical, *by individuals*, or *by particular churches*—for we know that, at different times, *such* doubts did exist—but she means to say, that she receives as canonical, those books *of which there never was any doubt in the WHOLE CHURCH UNIVERSAL*. And *this*, I may remark, is just the reason why the Church of England *rejects the Apocrypha*—at least it is *one* of the reasons,—because there *was* a period when *there existed an universal doubt respecting these books*. No catalogue can be produced which places them in the canon of Scripture previous to the Council of Carthage, in the close of the 4th century; therefore, before that period, there was not only universal doubt, but actual

opposition ; and hence the Church of England very consistently rejects those books.

Respecting the canonicity and inspiration of Scripture, Mr. Brown has talked much, and has put forth some difficulties which he thinks may strike on the mind of a Protestant. I shall give, now, a general answer to his statements on this subject. At the same time I cannot think that, when I am arguing with a Roman Catholic, who professes to believe the divine origin of the Bible, I am bound to show (especially in a place like this, in which, of course, God's Word ought to be revered) the proofs upon which we rest its divine authority. Yet some observations have been made on the other side which induce me to point out, as briefly as I can, somewhat of the evidence upon which we receive the Scripture as a divine revelation.

As a preliminary question, we may enquire, *what kind of evidence are we to expect* in this matter? Mr. Brown scouted, yesterday, the idea of what I called "*moral certainty*." To save time, I refer to my previous observations on this point, and will only say now, that, if we can furnish evidence sufficient to produce *moral certainty* of the genuineness, authenticity, canonicity, and inspiration of Scripture, *we act most inconsistently* if we do not receive it on *such* evidence, because we are acting every day upon moral certainty without actual demonstration.

In attempting, then, to give a *mere outline*, I observe, that the evidence upon which we receive the Scriptures, as a divine revelation, is *threefold*:—First, there is *historical* evidence: secondly, *internal* evidence: and thirdly, *experimental* evidence.

FIRST—we have HISTORICAL EVIDENCE. Mr. Brown has spoken much about tradition. Now I must explain the *essential difference* between tradition as held by *Roman Catholics* and by *Protestants*. With the latter, it simply means the *historical testimony*, or *mode of conveying*—with the former it means not only this, but also *the thing conveyed*. With the one it is merely the *modus tradendi*—with the other it is also the *res tradita*. Now tradition (as Protestants hold it) is the only means we have for ascertaining the genuineness or authenticity of *any ancient book*. It is just the means by which we ascertain the authenticity of Tacitus, Thucydides, Virgil, or any of the ancient authors. To apply, then, this species of evidence,

namely, the historical testimony, to the books of Scripture, I make the following remarks:—

I. During the first four centuries we find numerous quotations from the New Testament in the writings of the Fathers. This proves that they considered the books *genuine* and *authentic documents*. Not only did they regard them *thus*, but they quoted from them also *as inspired books*, and *put them into the catalogues* which they drew up. Hence this proves, *historically*, so far as the *friends* of Christianity are concerned, that, in the early ages, the books, which we receive as Scripture, were looked upon as *genuine, authentic, and inspired* books.

II. We are not, however, content with the mere evidence of the *friends* of Christianity, but we have recourse also to its *enemies*. We find, for example, Celsus, Porphyry, Julian the Apostate, and others, giving their attestation at least to *the existence* of the Gospels and Epistles in their time; and giving their attestation likewise to the fact that, however they themselves disbelieved them, they were *looked upon by many as a divine revelation*. When, by this historical evidence we have ascertained that, in the early ages, the books of *the New Testament*, which we now have, were received as authentic and inspired, we have no great difficulty in settling the inspiration of the *Old Testament*. We have only to ascertain what canon was held by the Jews (and that I shewed yesterday, upon the testimony of Josephus, Du Pin, and others), and to couple that with the Apostle's declaration, that "to the Jews were *committed the oracles of God*;" and likewise with another text of the New Testament—"All scripture is *given by inspiration of God*." And thus we arrive, *historically*, at the fact of the inspiration of the books of the Old Testament without any more lengthened investigation.

III. In addition to the historical evidence which I have already noticed, there is another species of it in the evidence of *Miracles*, which were wrought in attestation of their doctrine by the writers of the books of Scripture, and of which there can be no possible doubt, for the truth of them is proved by unexceptionable testimony, derived from *other* sources beside the Bible. On this, however, time will not permit me to enlarge.

IV. We possess, also, the evidence derived from *Prophecy*. I put this evidence here, though it is partly *internal*, for its strength arises from the fact that the *predictions* which are *in the Bible* are proved to be *divine by the wit-*

*ness of universal history to their accurate fulfilment.* The greatest infidels that ever lived have been compelled to admit the strength of this argument. Take the Old Testament Scriptures, and read the prophecy of the destruction of Babylon, and compare it with the accounts given by modern travellers, and, I ask, how is it possible that such declarations, minute and circumstantial as they were, should have been made ages before, and so accurately fulfilled, unless the mind of God had been with the writer? Look also to the prophecy of the four great kingdoms, mentioned by Daniel—look to many others—but look especially at the *state of the Jews* at the present day, and see how powerful is the evidence they furnish of the inspiration that guided the writers of the Bible. The Lord said of them of old—“YE ARE MY WITNESSES:” and so it has proved in these days, for *every Jew we meet is a living testimony to the inspiration of the books of Scripture.* Thus far for *historical* evidence.

SECONDLY—There is INTERNAL EVIDENCE; and it at least is natural to suppose that we should have this species of evidence in a revelation of God. Creation, by internal evidence, testifies to its great original; and if we look through the dispensations of life, varied and complicated as they are, we must irresistibly come to the conclusion, that there is a master hand, an Almighty Being, that guides and regulates the whole. Therefore I say, if creation, and if Providence, bear this internal testimony, we may *expect*, upon every principle of fair *analogy*, that if the Bible be a revelation from God, it shall contain *internal marks* of the *source* from whence it comes. I am not *assuming* here that the Bible is the word of God. I am merely arguing, in this place, upon principles which I conceive to be established by fair analogy. What, then, is the nature of the *internal evidence* of the inspiration of the Scriptures? I must state little more than *heads of thought* here, which you may follow out at your leisure:—

I. Consider the *exalted character that is given of God* in the Bible—a character far more glorious than ever the finest systems of philosophy have been able to devise.

II. Look to *the description of human nature*—the accurate manner in which the heart of man is dissected (if I may so speak), and its imaginations, dispositions, and practices told forth in a way that *experience* every day proves to be true.

III. Mark also *the provision which the Bible reveals* for

fallen and guilty man. Even conscience will tell a man, to a certain extent, that he is *a sinner*; and all the sacrifices that have existed in pagan nations attest, in some degree, and go upon the admission of, the existence of sin. Now, where is there such a provision for fallen men as is made in that book which professes to be a revelation from God? There is a remedy provided for man in whatever depth of sin and misery he may be found—a provision which the utmost wisdom of man could never have devised, and it must therefore have come from a source super-human—from God himself.

IV. Regard, moreover, *the morality contained in the Bible*, so widely different from the dry system of morals which ancient philosophers proposed for the acceptance of men.

V. Notice, lastly, *the impartial details of the Bible*. Why, sir, when a man writes the history of any individual's life—if he be a flatterer or admirer, you find him passing over his faults and foibles; while, if he be an enemy, he puts his faults out prominently, and keeps his virtues in the back-ground. But what is the case with respect to the historical details of the Bible? Take, for example, David, one of its most distinguished characters, and look at the impartiality which marks his history. It is shown most strikingly by the manner in which his faults and failings are put out, as it were, into stronger relief than usual. The same may be said *invariably* of the details of the Bible; and I feel assured that such impartiality is a powerful attestation to the fact of the super-human origin of the books thereof. Thus we have internal evidence, at which, however, I have been able only cursorily to glance.

THIRDLY—There exists EXPERIMENTAL EVIDENCE, and by this evidence we mean *the effects which the Bible produces*. We may see the effects either in reference to others or to ourselves; and, if it be lawful to judge from *practical results*, I think the fact has often been established, that the Bible must have been a revelation from God; seeing it has been so constantly, and so remarkably, *the means of changing men's characters*. And if the Bible testifies to me that the Spirit of God can “bear witness with my spirit” that I am a child of God, I cannot see why the Spirit should not likewise bear testimony to my spirit that the Bible is the word of God. Thus, upon *historical, internal, and experimental* evidence, we receive the Scripture as a divine revelation. In concluding *this brief out-*



*line*, I shall read a passage from a living author, which I think is strikingly illustrative of the three species of evidence:—

“These three kinds of evidence (namely, the historical, internal, and experimental,) are so entirely distinct in their nature, that they apply to other subjects. You have a substance which you suppose is phosphorus. For what reason? Why, in the first place, a boy, in whom you place confidence, brought it for you from the chemist’s, and he said it was phosphorus. This is the *historical* evidence: it relates to the history of the article before it came into your possession. In the second place, you *examine* it, and it looks like phosphorus. Its colour, consistence, and form, all agree. This is *internal* evidence: it results from internal examination. In the third place, you *try* it. It burns with a most bright and vivid flame. This last may be called *experimental* evidence: and it ought to be noticed, that this last is the best of the three. No matter what grounds of doubt or hesitation there may be in regard to the first and second kinds of evidence, if the article simply proves its properties on trial. If any one should say to you, “I have some reason to suspect that your messenger was not honest—he may have brought something else—or this does not look exactly like real phosphorus; it is too dark, or too hard”—your reply would be, ‘Sir, there can be no possible doubt about it. Just see how it burns.’

“Just so with the evidences of Christianity. It is interesting to look into the historical evidences that it is a revelation from heaven; and to contemplate also the internal indications of its origin: but, after all, the great evidence on which it is best for Christians, especially young Christians, to rely for the divine authority of the Bible, is, its present universal and irresistible power, in changing character and saving from suffering and sin.”—Abbott’s “Young Christian,” chap. 7.

---

THE REV. T. J. BROWN.

THERE has been a great deal of art employed by Mr. Tottenham, and I give him all due credit for it.—He began by telling you that the *revelation* of God contains all the doctrines which God wishes his followers to know; but he kept out of sight that distinction to which I have again and again invited your attention, that although *revelation* contains all that Christ wished men to know, yet the question is whether the *whole of revelation* is or is not contained in the written word? This is the point at issue, and this is the point which he has perpetually endeavoured to keep from your consideration.

You have been reminded that no one has commented, from the first time the text was proposed, upon 2 Tim. iii. 15—17. On this Mr. Tottenham seems to rest, as a most powerful and, what he conceives, an irresistible argument. Of course it is intended to prove that Scripture



contains *all things necessary* to be believed. I will then examine this decisive passage of Scripture, and see whether it bears out the Rev. Gentleman in the conclusion he put upon it; from this you will judge whether I passed over his array of texts for fear of examining them, or from a real persuasion that when you should come to review them at your leisure, you would discover that they do not authorize the positions for which they were adduced.

“From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.”

This is supposed to contain an explicit declaration that Scripture conveys to us *all* those revealed doctrines, the belief of which is *necessary* for salvation.

First, then, I wish to ask—Is all that is necessary for salvation contained in the *Old Testament alone*, or is any portion of that which is necessary to salvation contained in the New Testament in addition thereto? If Mr. Tottenham answers that some portion of that which is necessary to salvation is contained in the New Testament, I tell him this text proves nothing at all in support of his position; for it relates exclusively to the Old Testament, nor did I ever find a commentator who questioned this. “From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures,” &c. Now, when Timothy was a child, not a portion of the New Testament was written.

Secondly, There is another point on which Mr. Tottenham failed, and he failed in it throughout his attempts to avoid the force of my reasoning. Mr. Tottenham ought to have proved that *Scripture alone* contains *explicitly* all things necessary to salvation. Does St. Paul, in the passage adduced, assert this of the Scriptures either of the Old or New Testament? No such thing. He says—“From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation;” not because *all the doctrines of revelation* are said to be contained *explicitly therein*, but because they impart wisdom, *which conducts* a man unto salvation. So will *any portion* of Scripture impart wisdom which conducts to salvation; and, accordingly, we find in Scripture those proofs whereon rest *our doctrine of the unwritten word*. But the Scripture does not affirm, either in this or any other place, that the written word *by itself*, still less that any portion of it, is

sufficient to make a man acquainted with all the revelations communicated for the belief of his followers by Jesus Christ. This, however, is the real point at issue.

Again and again you have heard Mr. Tottenham call upon me to reply to his texts. I wished to save time ; and I was convinced that when you reviewed them at leisure, you would not be satisfied with their evidence. I have examined that one which he brought forward as the most decisive ; and you must see that it does not prove the position which he meant, and which he was bound to establish—that the Scriptures alone contained *explicitly all* the doctrines of revelation. I maintain, on the contrary, that he has no proofs (for he cannot adduce them ; neither the command of Christ, nor the inspiration of the Holy Ghost,) that the Apostles were bound to commit to writing *all the doctrines* they received from God : whereas to the rejection of any one of the doctrines which Christ communicated, is attached the penalty of eternal reprobation ; as is manifest by the authority I have so often appealed to, of Mark xvi. 16, wherein, without setting any limits to the word *gospel*, such as we have it *here* bound up in a few sheets, but extending it *to all the doctrines* which *he* came from heaven to reveal, he pronounces with respect *to each one* of them that “ he that doth not believe shall be damned.” The text from 2 Tim. does not therefore prove what Mr. Tottenham wants to prove : for 1st, if it proves any thing, it proves that the New Testament is not necessary ; but *that* it does not prove. 2ndly, Neither does it prove that either the New or Old Testament, or both combined, *explicitly* contain *all* the doctrines revealed for our belief. What it does prove is only that “ the Scriptures are able to make men wise unto salvation, *through faith* in Christ Jesus,” to which it conducts ; and that it is “ *profitable* for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness ; that the man of God may be perfect,” that is, in order that he may be brought into the way of obtaining perfection. *WE acknowledge all this*, which is not at all incompatible with our other doctrine ; and once more I remind you that Mr. Tottenham has not been able to allege a single text from Scripture which proves against us that *all* the doctrines of revelation are contained in the written word.

Mr. Lyons comes forward with certain charges respecting variations in our translations of the Bible, but these variations *do not affect, in a single instance, a matter of faith* ; they are only variations *in the choice of words*. These

have been improvements in the language ; but there has not, and I defy my Rev. opponent to shew that I err, a single variation regarding divine belief ; so that, in a subsequent edition, there has appeared any one doctrine in contradiction to some other that had been delivered in a previous edition. Is it so with the Protestant editions ?

Mr. Lyons and Mr. Tottenham misrepresented Mr. Macdonnell, wilfully I will not pretend to say, as if he referred his objection to that translation now in the hands of Protestants, which Mr. Tottenham called King James's Bible. Mr. Macdonnell referred to the errors introduced, for the purpose of creating a feeling against Catholics, into previous translations. These were very gross, and the fact is so avowed and notorious, we have but to read what certain Protestants themselves have written upon the translations which were put into the hands of the people, as containing the doctrines of faith, and as being the only rule whereby they were to learn the revelations of Christ. The ministers of the diocese of Lincoln, in an "Abridgment," &c. delivered to King James, designated the English translation, as one—

"That taketh away from the text, that addeth to the text, and that sometime to the changing or obscuring of the meaning of the Holy Ghost,—a translation which is absurd and senseless, *perverting in many places* the meaning of the Holy Ghost."

Burgess, in his "Apology," sect. 6, exclaims :—

"How shall I approve under my hand a translation which hath so many omissions, and many additions ; which sometimes obscures, *sometimes perverts the sense*, being sometimes senseless, sometimes contrary."

Broughton, in a Letter to the Lords of the Council, gives as a reason for requiring a new translation, without delay, "because that which is now in England is full of errors." In his "Advertisement of Corruptions," he tells the Bishops,

"That their public translations of the Scriptures into English is such, as that it perverts the text of the Old Testament in 848 places."

King James said he never saw a Bible well translated into English. Here, then, are declarations of gross errors in that translation of the Bible, from which alone, according to the Protestant principle, the people could derive the true word of God. Can any such errors be demonstrated in the Catholic Bible ? Can a single instance (I shall be satisfied with a single instance) be adduced to show that in any Catholic editions there has been a contrariety of *doctrines* delivered ?

But the errors in the Protestant Bible are not confined

to errors in that translation, which preceded the present one, or King James's Bible. The Rev. Mr. Curtis, a Dissenting minister, a short time since, addressed four letters to the Bishop of London, in which he charged *your present Bibles* with containing the grossest falsehoods; and he contends that—

“ So far as the *English text of the English Bible* is in question, we clearly have *all our modern Bibles* printed after copies of *no authority*, or after bad and erroneous authority, with the important exception of what remains of the authorized version itself.”

He also states that in only seven books of the Oxford edition of the Scripture he has detected more than 2931 intentional departures from the truth in the *authorized* version; that is, the version commonly called King James's Bible; the version now in the hands of Protestants. He maintains that Dr. Blaney, of Oxford, and the Oxford Reformers of the text, were disgracefully ignorant, and unfit for the task. He contends that the erroneous punctuation sometimes affects the sense; and that the departures from the authorized version *are of serious moment*.

This is speaking of an edition of your present translation. Is there not an attempt then at unfair evasion—is there not an attempt to impose on your common sense, when endeavours are used to persuade you that our alterations, which are in matters of such trifling consequence as the improvement of language, are of the same character as yours?

Mr. Tottenham told us that our Lord and the Apostles quoted from the corrupted Septuagint; but was not our Lord *truth itself*, and were not his Apostles endowed with *infallibility* by the Holy Ghost? Will Mr. T. say that because Christ and his Apostles were not exposed to error in quoting from a corrupt edition, therefore *Protestants*, who are not endowed with like infallibility, will be able to find in a corrupt edition of the Scriptures the words of eternal truth, or that they will be able to distinguish the corrupted portions from those that are not corrupted?

Mr. Tottenham brought forward the creed of Pope Pius the 4th, for the purpose of showing you that we are bound to interpret Scripture always according to the unanimous exposition of the Holy Fathers; so that if the Holy Fathers differ in their interpretation we are thrown into contradictions. Here is another gross attempt to impose upon your common sense, and I wonder how Mr. Tottenham could have been guilty of it. The words of the Creed of Pope Pius the 4th, are—

"I admit the Holy Scriptures, according to that sense which our Holy Mother, the Church, has held, and does hold ; to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures ; neither will I ever take and interpret them *otherwise* than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers."

What mean these latter words? Mr. Tottenham puts upon them this meaning, "I will always interpret *according* to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." Now, the words are — "Neither will I ever take and interpret them, *otherwise than according to* the unanimous consent of the Fathers ;" meaning, I will never interpret them *contrary* thereto : or, which is the same thing, whenever the Holy Fathers are *morally unanimous* on the meaning of a passage of Scripture, so far only we are bound to interpret the inspired book according to their exposition. In a word, we are bound by this Creed, not to interpret the Scripture *contrary to their unanimous consent* ; but it does not affirm that *upon every point* we profess to have such unanimous consent. In the Latin original it is expressed thus : "nec eam unquam, nisi juxta unanimum consensum Patrum accipiam et interpretabor." Were I to submit these words to any impartial person acquainted with the force of terms in the Latin or English language, and ask him to give me the meaning of the controverted passage, I am convinced that his interpretation would agree with mine. I have besides another answer : this part of the creed is, we must suppose, ambiguous, and if you will not agree with my interpretation, who is therefore to judge of its real meaning? There is not a Protestant whose candid judgment I should fear herein to abide by ; however, of the meaning of our own creeds *we* are the best judges. Now, I assert, as a Catholic minister, and I shall be supported by all the Catholics present, that by the Creed of Pius IV. we do not profess to have for the whole of Scripture a unanimous interpretation of the Fathers : but as I have again and again said, this passage clearly to our minds means, that we will not interpret Scripture *in contradiction* to their unanimous testimony.

Mr. T. has again brought before you the divisions amongst Catholics. I cannot see how any man, acquainted with Ecclesiastical history, can cite the divisions between Catholics, and compare them with those among Protestants. He must know that Catholics have never separated from each other, or had divisions upon any defined points of their faith. Those are not Catholics who believe *any*

*thing contrary to the faith of the Catholic Church.* Catholics have never been divided amongst themselves in such a way as Protestants have been divided; of whom one sect maintains for example the necessity of baptism, another maintains that it is not necessary; yet both appeal to the same rule—both affect to ground their contradictory doctrines on the word of God. Ask them, and each sect will tell you that it holds its peculiar doctrine to be an article of *divine faith*, and that the opposite sentiment is contrary to the word of God.

The divisions of Catholics do not amount to this; they are upon matters of *opinion* only. But if serious disputes arise, no sooner does the authority of the Church interpose than unity which characterises the Catholic Church, is to be found amongst all its members; and where there is an instance of a Catholic refusing to receive the truth of doctrine from the Church, and depending only on his private judgment in interpreting the word of God in opposition to the Church, that moment he ceases to be a Roman Catholic. Let not, then, our divisions be brought forward on questions not of faith but of *mere opinion*; as well might you bring forward our diversities on political questions.

The Gentleman opposite said that we are divided as to where infallibility resides. We are not divided in faith upon this point. No; it is a part of our belief that infallibility resides in the Church; for Christ declared that he would be with his Apostles, and consequently, with their successors, to the consummation of the world; and, therefore, we know that infallibility resides with the successors of the Apostles, and teaching ministers of the Catholic Church. We believe not only that the Catholic Church will not teach error, but that she will not permit error to be taught; we believe that her children may repose with security upon the promises of Christ that he will abide with his ministers, and that the Spirit of Truth shall conduct them to all truth.

But Mr. T. tells us that we are divided about the characteristics of general councils. There is not amongst us any difference of Catholic belief thereon. There may be some speculative matters of little consequence upon which Catholics *think* differently; but upon essential and practical points all agree. We all hold that where there is a general assembly of Christian bishops, called by the sovereign pontiff, the chief of the Catholic bishops, and where such an assembly is allowed to discuss with full



liberty doctrines of faith, there is no danger of error with regard to any point upon which this council shall decide.

Mr. T. has charged me with misrepresenting the last moments of Bishop Jewel. The account, he says, given by Dr. Smith was not published during the reign of Elizabeth. I am not aware that a history should necessarily be published during the life-time of the party to whom it relates. We have many authentic histories which were not published for years and centuries after the events they record; but this account, which declares that Jewel on his death-bed acknowledged and regretted his having uttered such calumnious invectives against Catholics, which were avowedly contrary to his own judgment, was published during the life-time of Dr. Twin, who had received the account from the chaplain to Bishop Jewel, and during the life-time of the two noblemen to whom Dr. Twin made the communication. If, therefore, this communication was not really made to Dr. Twin, or by him (as was related), he and those noblemen would have found themselves bound to come forward and assert the consistency of Jewel. The fact that they did not do so establishes the truth of that communication, and thus it stands on much higher ground than most of the events admitted as authentic history.

I come next to a most important declaration of Mr. T. I know not if it agree with *your* sentiments, but I know it would have drawn down the severe censure of the ancient divines of the Protestant Church. He says, "we do not affirm that the inspiration of Scripture is *an object of faith*, but that it is *a means only*!" Is this the case? Is this Protestant doctrine? Do you then maintain the inspiration of Scripture to be *not an object of faith*? When you kiss the book do you not profess *your belief* that this book is inspired by God? Do you mean to say that it is merely the means from which your faith is derived, but that you do not *believe* the books of Scripture to be the revealed word of God? Did Mr. T. represent *your* doctrine or misrepresent it? I trust, for the honour of religion, that he committed himself in speaking over hastily; for he did affirm that the inspiration of Scripture is *not an object of faith*, but *the means only*. If he gives up that point to the infidel, I know not what point he will not be disposed to give up. But I am aware of his difficulty. If he admit the inspiration of Scripture it must be *by tradition only*; he cannot establish it by the written word; he has



not one explicit text which will prove the inspiration of *the whole* Scripture. If he cannot show the inspiration of the whole Scripture by its own testimony, then, according to his rule of faith, he is not able to make an act of divine belief upon the inspiration of the sacred volume put into your hands. He felt this difficulty; and feeling it he gave utterance to a sentiment which I am inclined to think he will be disposed to recall.

Mr. Tottenham expounds the rule prescribed in the common prayer book, in the 6th article, to determine what is Scripture and what is not:—

“ In the name of the holy Scripture we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church ;”

that is, says he, the *whole* Church. Such is the meaning which he puts upon it; but “it is not in the bond,” which says only, “ of whose authority there never was *any doubt in the Church.*” Luther was far more consistent, I must say, than English Protestants; for feeling that he could not apply the rule of tradition, he actually excluded from the canon of Scripture all those books of which it could be shewn that there was any doubt in the primitive Church. Accordingly, he and his immediate followers did not admit the canonicity of the Epistles of James, Jude, the 2nd and 3rd of Peter, the 2nd and 3rd of John, the Revelations, and the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Protestants of Germany reject tradition; and what is the consequence?—that rejecting its authority, they openly reject also their certainty in the canonicity and inspiration of the sacred writings; and consequently throw overboard many books which Protestants of this country receive as inspired. The immortal Semler, as he is called, rejected the Old Testament; Doderlein, all but the Law; there are others who reject the whole of certain books, some the Gospels, others the whole or portions of the Epistles. Why do they thus mutilate the Scriptures? Because they cannot find by their only rule of faith any clear demonstration as to which books belongs the canon, or which were truly inspired.

Mr. T. said that he was not bound to adduce proofs of the genuineness, authenticity, and inspiration of the sacred books. I have not questioned their *genuineness* and *authenticity*, these he may be able to prove. But, he says, that he is not to be called upon to prove their inspiration by a Roman Catholic, who admits it. I feel, however, that I am justified in calling upon him to produce his proofs,

that I may shew thereby the inconsistency of his rule of faith; *not that I question their inspiration.* I maintain, on the contrary, that *Catholics* hold the inspiration of Scripture on far more secure grounds than our opponents do; for I have shown that many books of Scripture are rejected by Protestants, because having no consistent rule to determine what is inspired or what is not, they are left in uncertainty on that important matter. What I do, therefore, is not to question inspiration, but to call upon Mr. T. to prove, *according to his principles*, the inspiration of the sacred books. He must show, *by the written word*, that *the whole of Scripture* is inspired, and not this or that part only.

To bring the discussion to a point, I will select the Gospel of St. Luke, or the Acts of the Apostles, or the Epistle to Philemon. Let Mr. T. prove, for example, that St. Paul was inspired to write this Epistle to Philemon, which he will find a matter of great difficulty. I am satisfied that he will not be able to make it good by any other authority, (and I hope he will attempt the task,) than by tradition and the authority of the Church. He may tell you that the Apostles were *inspired to preach*, (this even is a point upon which I might call for *his* proofs;) and that the Apostles were preserved from error; but inspiration *to preach* and preservation from error are not inspiration *to write*; they are two widely different things. Besides, were the Apostles inspired *in all that they orally delivered*? If not, how will you prove that they were inspired *in all that they wrote*? Whence does it appear that *inspiration* was given them even *to write at all*? Now I will produce a proof from Scripture, that the Apostles were liable to commit mistakes, not indeed on doctrines of faith, but on other matters which they orally delivered. In Acts xx. 25, the Apostle says to the elders of Ephesus, "Behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, *shall see my face no more.*" Here is a solemn declaration that he was coming no more amongst them; that they should "see his face no more." Did the Apostle Paul then never return to that scene of his labours? I find the most learned biblical critics, Protestants as well as Catholics, allowing *that he did*; and saying that the Apostle *made a mistake* when he declared that he should not return thither: so say St. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Pearson, Cappel, Usher, Mauduit, Beausobre, Dodridge, and a variety of others whom I might cite on this

point. Now, how will you by your principles be convinced that the Apostles, who, although they could not err on matters regarding doctrines of faith, yet could err on other matters, were not only preserved from error, but *inspired to write* upon subjects of *history*, and upon *purely domestic concerns*, such as are treated of in the Epistle to Philemon?

Again, Mr. T. has talked about the sufficiency of moral certainty. But I cannot persuade myself of his sincerity in upholding an error of the most dangerous consequence, that moral certainty of any kind will suffice for *divine faith*. The moment you begin to doubt the revelation of God, or you conceive it *possible* that the doctrines you hold by revelation can be erroneous, that moment you renounce divine faith. Now, however great your moral certainty may be, there is always *a possibility* that you may be in error, which at once excludes divine faith; for then it does not rest on the *unerring* word of God.

Mr. T. has descanted upon three kinds of evidence;—*historical* evidence, *internal* evidence, and *experimental* evidence. Speaking of historical evidence, he refers those doctrines which Protestants hold by tradition to historical testimony, considered as the *modus tradendi*, the traditional manner in which they are handed down, but he does not admit the *res tradita*, which Catholics acknowledge. Catholics, it is true, receive tradition in its two-fold meaning; they admit the “*modus tradendi*,” and the “*res tradita*.” We consider the Fathers as the “*modus tradendi*,” but we hold such doctrines as they have handed down to us by their morally unanimous testimony, whether contained in writing, or otherwise delivered, as the “*res tradita*,” and these form a part of the articles of our belief. If Protestants do not admit this two-fold distinction, they will not be able to establish several of the doctrines which they profess to believe; and amongst the rest, the canonicity and inspiration of the Scriptures.

Mr. T. speculated likewise on internal evidence. This, I maintain, is not adequate to prove the inspiration of Scripture. For, first, either it is conceded to all men, or a few only are able to discover it. If a few only, how are you to discern who have the benefit of this internal evidence?—which those are, who, by the internal suggestions of the Holy Spirit, can distinguish what is inspired Scripture, and what is not? But if (since all the books of Scripture are held by Protestants to be the only rule of faith) we must suppose that their internal evidence may

be discovered by *all men*, whence comes it to pass that so many have differed as to what books constitute the canon of Scripture? Whence came it that Luther rejected from the canon so many books which English Protestants admit? Whence comes it that the German Protestants have been unable to discover the internal evidence which Mr. Tottenham claims for himself; and that therefore so many books are rejected by them which he receives? Whence comes it that, in the primitive ages, there was so long a doubt in the Church *upon several of those books*, if they possessed internal evidence? But this internal evidence is indeed a dangerous thing to meddle with. It frequently leads to fanaticism; and we have seen a dreadful instance in a gentleman, who used to stand forth upon the platform of the Reformation Society to defend its tenets. I have heard him appeal with violent gesticulation to this evidence: I have heard him say that it was as clear as the splendours of the sun and moon are to our eyes. What has been the consequence of relying upon internal evidence? The Rev. Nicholas Armstrong has been ejected from the Reformation Society, and is gone over to the fanatical doctrines of Irving! Such as this will be always the consequence of relying upon similar internal evidence. Bring a Mahometan before you, let him hear you admit the security of internal evidence,—and you will not convict *him* of absurdity. *You* say that *you* hold the *Scripture* by internal evidence, and *he* will tell you that *he* maintains his belief in the *Koran* by the same.

But I will bring this matter to a test. If there be such internal evidence as is described, it must be discoverable by all men. Now let us bring forward any one, not deeply read in the Scriptures;—I will set before him some of the apocryphal books and some of the inspired books, as they are distinguished by Protestants, and I will rest my conclusion on the fact, that the ignorant Protestant will not be able to discern one from the other by that light and splendour of internal evidence which Mr. T. says is in the inspired writings. Think you that he will discover that the prophecy of *Baruch* manifests not this internal evidence; and that the prophecy of *Jeremy* does manifest it? Will he determine that *the book of Judges* does exhibit it; and that the apocryphal books of the *Machabees* do not? If ever this internal evidence existed, it must have existed in the words spoken by Christ. Yet the Jews did not discover in them its splendour: no; nor does Christ say that

they are condemned, merely because they did not discover in his words any internal evidence that proved his divinity. He declares (John xv. 22, 24), that if he had not come and spoken to them, and *done amongst them* those things *which no other man did*, they had not sinned; but now he adds they have no excuse for their sin. There cannot be clearer internal evidence in Scripture, than in the words which the Almighty himself utters. Now we find in 1 Sam. chap. 3rd, that the Lord spoke to Samuel *three times*. Did Samuel discover in the words that God thus spoke to him, any proof or internal evidence that they were the words of God, even though they were addressed to him by the mouth of God? No; he mistook them for the words of Eli; he thought they were the words of the high priest.—In the book of Judges, chap. 7, we find Gideon not discerning any internal evidence in the words of God; for he required a miracle before he would believe them. Peter also, in Acts, chap. 12, does not discover, when the angel appears unto him, any testimony of internal evidence in his words. By a miracle only he is convinced that they were the words of a heavenly messenger, sent to him by God. There does not exist therefore any internal evidence in the Holy Scriptures, whereby the inspiration of all their parts is manifested.

The Reverend Gentleman refers finally to *experimental* evidence. His experimental evidence is much of the same character as internal evidence. I will read a short passage from a Protestant author, who was as much able to judge upon the point of internal or experimental evidence as Mr. Tottenham. Limbroch in his *Theologia Christiana*, lib. i. c. No. 17, says—

“That there exists the divine Spirit, no one can know but from Scripture; therefore, *the divinity of Scripture ought to be pre-supposed and acknowledged, before any one can be certain that the testimony which he feels in his heart can be the testimony of the Spirit*; otherwise a way is opened to enthusiasm. . . . . For, if they be asked, how they can know the Scripture to be divine? They will answer, by the internal testimony of the Spirit. If they be urged, whence can they know that the testimony which they feel in their heart is the instinct of the Holy Spirit? They will reply, from Scripture. Besides the testimony of the Holy Spirit serves only to confirm those who experience it: for no other can be convinced by the private spirit of any one: but we require arguments by which others may be persuaded of the divinity of Scripture, and be brought to acknowledge it.”

Hence Protestants themselves have given up this point to Catholics, and in accordance with our doctrine have referred to tradition *as the only means* to assure them of

the inspiration of Scripture. Bell, p. 134, in his *Down-fall of Popery*, writes thus—

“As Papists admit *the Jews' tradition* of the Old Testament to be God's Word, and withal refuse many other traditions of theirs: so *Protestants admit this tradition* (of the inspiration of the Bible) and reject all others.”

Jeremy Taylor, in his *Dissuasive from Popery*, part ii. remarks—

“It is said, that the *Scripture itself is wholly derived to us by tradition*, and therefore besides Scripture tradition is necessary in the Church. *No man that understands this question denies it.* . . . . For no man inquires whether the Scriptures contain all things necessary for salvation? Unless he believe that there are Scriptures: that these are they: and that they are the Word of God: *all this comes to us by tradition*, that is, by universal, undeniable, testimony.”

Hooker, in his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, book iii. No. 8, observes—

“The question being, by what means we are taught this (that the Scripture is divine and sacred). Some answer, that to learn it *we have no other way than only tradition*, . . . . and by experience we only know that the first outward motive leading men so to esteem of the Scripture, is the authority of God's church.”

I wish, therefore, in conclusion, to impress this upon you, that the doctrines which Protestants hold upon the canonicity of Scripture and its inspiration, can be maintained by the testimony of *tradition only*; and moreover, that if they hold the canonicity and inspiration of Scripture not to be matters of divine faith, the consequence is, that they have *no divine assurance that the Scriptures are inspired*, a proposition that will shock most of you. There are other doctrines dependent exclusively upon tradition, which I will, to-morrow, bring forward, and which it will be still more difficult to dispose of; for my opponents must either maintain them to be matters of divine belief, or, by giving that up, they will abandon a large portion of their faith. It follows, then, that, to be consistent, they cannot admit as *a sole rule* of faith the Scriptures alone; that they must not only add tradition thereto, but also they must admit the authority of the church.

[The discussion was closed for this day.]

THIRD DAY.—Friday, Feb. 28, 1834.

---

SUBJECT:

THE RULE OF FAITH (*continued.*)

THE CHAIRMAN.—Ladies and Gentlemen, the Discussion on the Rule of Faith will now be resumed.

THE REV. E. TOTTENHAM.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—After a long interval from the time at which I quoted the passage, Mr. Brown, at the close of yesterday's discussion, referred to the text from the 2nd Epistle to Timothy, which, in my view of the matter, goes to establish most powerfully the sufficiency of the written Word as a rule of faith. I shall read the passage again—

“Continue thou (says the Apostle Paul to Timothy) in those things which thou hast learned, and which have been committed to thee; knowing of whom thou hast learned them: and because from thy infancy thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, *which can instruct thee to salvation*, by the faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture inspired of God, is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice, that the man of God may be *perfect, furnished to every good work.*”

Upon this passage Mr. Brown asks, are all necessary things contained in the Old Testament alone, or do we find only a portion of those things that are necessary? And he asserts that my argument, to be good for any thing, must rest on the position that all necessary truth is contained in the Old Testament. Now, if Mr. Brown had exercised his memory (and I am sure many here will recollect the fact), he would have known that, at the very outset of my commenting on this passage, I started with the assertion that it *did* prove that all truth, *absolutely necessary for salvation*, was contained in the *Old Testament Scriptures*; and the argument derived from it was, that, if this was the case with regard to the Old Testament *alone*, according to the testimony of this passage, *a fortiori*, it must be the case with regard to the Old Testament and the New *together*.



But my Reverend opponent, in this matter, seems to suppose (and this is just the mistake into which Dr. Milner falls, in his "*End of Controversy*,") that Christ, when he appeared in our world, came to introduce a *new religion*, and to give a *new rule of faith*! He came, however, to do no such thing, but to give a *fuller display of the very same religion that had been in existence since the fall*. He came "not to destroy the law, but to *fulfil it*." Previous to the fall, indeed, there had been a *covenant of works* between God and man, but immediately after the fall the *covenant of grace* commenced. Of this there have been different dispensations, under which (as we see by a reference to many passages in the New Testament, as well as in the Old) men were saved *according to the same plan*, though that plan was sometimes more darkly, and sometimes more clearly, developed.

We are told, moreover, that, if this text proves anything, it proves *that the New Testament was unnecessary*. It proves, however, no such thing; for though Christ came, not to introduce an essentially new religion, but to give a fuller display of that religion which, since the fall, had been *radically the same*, yet the New Testament was necessary, *for this latter purpose*, and for declaring how all the types and prophecies of the Old, relative to his sufferings and death, had been *fulfilled*. The Old Testament, therefore, was sufficient for the time being; but when its prophecies and types were fulfilled, the New was necessary for the declaration of that fulfilment.

Mr. Brown has, again and again, insisted that I am bound to prove that Scripture contains all necessary truth. This, I say, I *have*, again and again, proved; and I contend, that the passage to which I have just now referred, supposing that there were no other in the entire Bible, proves it beyond question. For, if the written word can "*instruct unto salvation*,"—and if "all Scripture, inspired of God, is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice, that the man of God may be *perfect, furnished to every good work*," then it is difficult, indeed, for an unprejudiced mind to avoid the conclusion, that Scripture contains, within itself, all things necessary to be believed for salvation.

An objection was raised to my arguing from the fact, that Christ and his Apostles quoted from the Septuagint, because, as my opponent says, Christ and his Apostles, being infallible, could distinguish between what was right

and what was wrong in the translation. I referred to the fact, when the subject of translations was introduced, only to shew that Christ and his Apostles recognized the Septuagint, though it is well known that it was a translation *not altogether* perfect; and I thought I might, therefore, fairly draw the inference, that, while it is important to have a translation as correct as possible, the poor man may be contented with one, though it be *not absolutely perfect in every particular*.

When I asserted that Roman Catholics were divided upon the very foundation of their system, namely, the *place where infallibility resides*, Mr. Brown declared that there was no disagreement upon this point, because they all agreed that the infallibility was to be found *in the church*. Really, Sir, this word *church* is a most useful word to Roman Catholics in the controversy; it seems to have a kind of talismanic effect in settling all differences. But whilst I admit, and did then admit, that Roman Catholics profess, *generally*, that infallibility is to be found *in the church*, I contended then, and proved then, and I still contend, that Roman Catholics are divided *as to what precise locality* in the church this prerogative of infallibility occupies. I quoted one council of Doctors which declared, that the authority of a council was superior to that of a Pope; and another, that the authority of a Pope was superior to that of a council. I also referred to Dr. De La Hogue's *Tractatus de Ecclesiâ*, which is the class-book at Maynooth College, and to Charles Butler's *Book of the Roman Catholic Church*, and these stated that the Ultra-montanists (or Italians) asserted *the personal infallibility of the Pope*, whereas the French Church denied such a doctrine, and said, that the Pope might be "deposed by the church, or a general council, for heresy or schism." THESE ARE MY DOCUMENTS, and Mr. Brown, when giving a *general* denial, *has not noticed the documents on which I based my assertion*.

Again—When I stated that Roman Catholics were divided also *as to what constituted a council universal or legal*, Mr. Brown denied this division too, and he said, that all that was requisite, in order to constitute a council universal and legal, was, that it should be an assembly of Bishops, *convened by the supreme Pontiff, and possessing full liberty of discussion*. Now, what has Mr. Brown done by that definition of the matter? He has actually, by his own rule, *thrown overboard eight out of the eighteen*

*General Councils*, namely, *the eight Eastern Councils*: for it is a well-established fact that not one of them was summoned by a Pope, but *all by the Emperors*; and this is a statement which I rest (amongst other authorities) upon the testimony of DU PIN, the Roman Catholic historian, who says, in precise words, that the first eight councils were summoned by the Emperors.

If more proof were wanted on this point, I have a long chain of evidence here, which will establish it, although Mr. Brown denies that there is any division among Roman Catholics as to what constitutes the universality and legality of councils. The use I made of this point when I first pressed it was this: Roman Catholics speak of the *security* of the people—that, according to their system, they are taught the truth infallibly: but I say, they are encompassed with difficulties far beyond what the Protestant has to contend with. Even supposing that, when all necessary forms and circumstances are complied with, the Roman Catholic Church should declare the truth of God, yet inasmuch as the decrees of the Church are said to be put forth by a general council, with the Pope at its head, the Roman Catholic will have to inquire and find out a number of things, before he can be certain that any decree was put forth *by a lawful council*, and is therefore binding on him as divine truth. When the decrees of certain councils are put before him as professing to contain truth, he will have to ask the question, “*How am I to know that such councils are general?*” Then he finds *three opinions*, even among Roman Catholic Doctors, as to what constitutes a council *general*: and he must satisfy himself upon that point, as well as upon what is necessary to make a council *legal*, before, *even on his own principles*, he can admit the decrees as a general expression of the truth of God. This is the use I made of the matter, as placing the Roman Catholic in a difficulty, out of which the poor man can never get.

Mr. Brown observed upon what he styles an important declaration that was made by me, when I said that the Bible, strictly speaking, was not the *object* of faith but rather the *means* of it. Then he made a strong appeal to our good friends present, and asked them if such were their opinion: and he concluded by saying that he trusts, for the honour of religion, I have “*committed myself!*” What I said then, however, I stand by, and I do not look for any such dreadful consequence as Mr. Brown would

apprehend. *I did not say it was not necessary to receive the Bible as a divine revelation*, but I said that, strictly speaking, the Bible was not the OBJECT of man's faith, but was the MEANS of it.

Let us, therefore, examine what the Scripture says on the subject, and we shall see whether my dreadful assertion, or Mr. Brown's denial, is most in accordance with it. In the 1st chapter of St. James and the 18th verse, we read thus—

“Of his own will hath he begotten us *by the word of truth*, that we might be some beginning of his creatures.”

Here we see *the word of truth* is the means which God uses for man's regeneration. Again, in the 1st Epistle of St. Peter, the 1st chapter and the 23d verse, it is said—

“Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but incorruptible, *by the Word of God*, who liveth and remaineth for ever.”

The same truth is in this place asserted by St. Peter. These two passages, therefore, prove that the Bible, according to the testimony of James and Peter, was rather looked upon as the *means* of faith than, strictly speaking, as the *object* of it.

When I was yesterday adducing the proofs and evidences upon which Protestants, independent of the infallible decision of any Church, received the Bible as a divine revelation—when I was adverting to the historical, internal, and experimental evidences of the truth of Scripture—Mr. Brown objected to the doctrine of *moral certainty*, upon which I insisted. I said, that we received the Scripture, so far as historical evidence was concerned, on such evidence as amounted to moral certainty, though we have not actual mathematical demonstration of the matter, because such was absolutely impossible. In proving the genuineness or authenticity of *any* ancient book, I asserted that this was quite sufficient for us, and the ONLY species of evidence we COULD have; and that, moreover, we were *believing and acting, every day of our lives, on what we call moral certainty*, without actual demonstration. Of all this I gave practical instances. Mr. Brown, however, objects to such a foundation, and says, that it would not be sufficient on which to rest faith. Then, I ask in reply, *what greater foundation than moral certainty has Mr. Brown, as a Roman Catholic, with regard to his religion?* It is true, he will tell me he believes the Bible, and the doctrines of his religion, *because the Church declares respecting them*. But then, I ask, how does *he*

*know the Church? How does he find out the Church?* And I wish to trace out this point, in order to shew that he has no greater certainty than the Protestant has, and I contend, not half so much. Hear Mr. Brown's own words as to the manner in which he discovers the Church. I hold in my hand a pamphlet, professing to contain the substance of the arguments used at the Cheltenham Discussion, and published by Mr. Brown. In this he says—

“Considering the Scripture as an *authentic* work, we are able to prove by its testimony the unerring authority of the Church; the authority of the Church proposes to us the unwritten word; and upon its declaration, we form our act of Divine faith in the *inspiration* of Scripture.”

Mark, what is the first thing and the remote foundation upon which Mr. Brown rests all this? It is upon Scripture simply *as an authentic work*. Now, if I ask Mr. Brown to prove the *authenticity* of the Scriptures, he will prove it *just by the historical evidence I adduced yesterday*, which is productive only of *moral certainty*: and therefore, if we trace the matter thus home, you see neither Mr. Brown, nor any other Roman Catholic, has at the last, any thing more to rest upon than moral certainty, although he complains of us for having no better foundation.

With regard to the internal evidence for the Divine authority of Scripture, that I yesterday spoke of, Mr. Brown says, *that* species of proof can be of no consequence. Why? Because it is not palpable to all: and then he tells us that Luther did not see internal evidence in one book; and other persons did not see internal evidence in other books, which we now receive as canonical Scripture. But, I ask, does it follow, that, because certain persons *do not see* the evidence, therefore the evidence does not exist? I know it to be a fact, that some Roman Catholic Divines (and perhaps in the discussion of the next subject I shall refer more particularly to it), namely, Cardinal Cajetan and others, *did not see transubstantiation in Scripture*, but believed it simply on the authority of the Church; and all Protestant Christendom does not see transubstantiation in Scripture. Upon the same principle, therefore, as that upon which Mr. Brown has argued, I might say that Scripture proofs should go for nothing with him in favour of transubstantiation, because many *do not see them*. This is just as legitimate as Mr. Brown's conclusion, that internal evidence is not to be depended on, because some do not see it. Thus, his

argument is overthrown here by producing a parallel one respecting a doctrine of his own Church.

Amongst a number of quotations from Protestant divines, my Rev. opponent yesterday quoted Hooker, *as if he spoke against* the internal evidence of Scripture, and received the Scriptures solely on the authority of the Church. I shall give the passage that Mr. Brown quoted, *but I shall do so at a little greater length than he ventured.* Here are Hooker's words, in the 3rd book of his Ecclesiastical Polity, sect. 8 :—

“ Scripture teacheth us that saving truth which God hath discovered unto the world by revelation, and it presumeth us taught otherwise, that itself is divine and sacred. The question then being *by what means* we are taught this; some answer, that to learn it we have no other way than tradition; as namely, that so we believe, because we from our predecessors, and they from theirs, have so received. But is this enough? That which all men's experience teacheth them may not in any wise be denied; and by experience we all know that the *first outward motive* leading men to esteem of the Scripture, is the authority of God's Church.”

Here Mr. Brown stopped. I shall give you the rest :—

“ For when we know the whole Church of God hath that opinion of the Scripture, we judge it at the first an impudent thing for any man, bred and brought up in the Church, to be of a contrary mind without cause. Afterwards, *the more we bestow our labour upon reading, or hearing the mysteries thereof, the more we find that the thing itself doth answer our received opinion concerning it*; so that the *former* inducement prevailing *somewhat* with us before, *doth now much more prevail, when the very thing hath ministered farther reason.*”

This is the whole passage, and we find by it that Hooker, so far from resting the belief of Scripture *simply* upon the authority of the Church, merely says it is *the first outward motive, not the last assurance*, upon which we rest; and that when, simply so far as regards the outward motive, we receive the Scriptures on the authority of the Church, we then find, *by an examination of the Scriptures themselves*, that they present *internal evidence* of their divine origin. Thus, though we have *some* opinion of their divine origin *before*, though “ the *former* inducement prevail *somewhat* with us,” yet now he says, “ *Much more doth it prevail, WHEN THE VERY THING HATH MINISTERED FARTHER REASON.*” After this, will it be said that Hooker threw the internal evidence overboard?

Now, Sir, you will recollect that when I started on the first day in the consideration of the Apocryphal question, and when I adduced an array of evidence, external in its nature, to prove that the Apocryphal books, so called, were not to be received into the canon of Scripture; when I shewed that the Jews did not receive them (which I proved



both on Jewish and Roman Catholic testimony)—when I referred to the fact that Christ and his Apostles did not recognise them—when I noticed ten or twelve catalogues in the early Church which did not admit them—when, I say, I entered upon these points, Mr. Brown complained that I should have touched upon the Apocryphal question at all, and insisted that I was bound in fairness to defend my own rule, and not to attack his. Since that (though I don't conceive I am bound to do so either by the rules or by the principles of honour which have been alluded to on the other side) I have abstained from the discussion of this question. But now I am happy that Mr. Brown has relieved me out of the difficulty in which I was placed; for, by an observation which he made yesterday, he leads me directly to examine the Apocrypha on the ground of internal evidence. He says he will bring internal evidence to a point, and he asks, if any one will read the books called Apocryphal, and also the books generally acknowledged, is it possible that from the reading of those books, he would discover internal evidence *in favour of* the one and internal evidence *against* the other? He has thus led me himself to the subject, and I shall, therefore, give you something more in reference to it.

I shall not dwell any more on *external* evidence, as I have sufficiently adduced that on the former occasion; but let me say, first of all, in reference to this matter of INTERNAL EVIDENCE, that *the prophecy of Malachi intimates that the prophetic spirit should cease with him, until a certain period which is mentioned.* I refer to the 4th chapter of this prophecy, from the 4th to the 6th verses:—

“Remember the law of Moses, my servant, which I commanded him in Horeb for all Israel, the precepts and judgments. *Behold, I will send you Elias the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord.* And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers; lest I come and strike the earth with anathema.”

Thus, when the Lord is speaking by his prophet, he says at the close of the book, “*Behold, I will send you Elias the prophet, before,*” &c.; and is there not something in this expression which intimates that the prophetic spirit *should cease till Elias made his appearance on the stage of life?*

But I go farther, and say, that the writers of the books of the Apocrypha, instead of claiming inspiration, as the writers of the books generally received are found to do, on the contrary, *frequently disclaim the idea of such inspi-*



*ration.* I have several passages on this subject, and shall refer you, in the first place, to the 2nd chapter of the 2nd book of Maccabees, where we find that the author, so far from claiming inspiration, *actually disclaims it*; for he tells us, that *this book was only an abridgment which was drawn up from a work already in existence!* Look at the 2nd chapter, and let us begin at the 20th verse:—

“ Now as concerning Judas Machabæus and his brethren, and the purification of the great temple, and the dedication of the altar. As also the wars against Antiochus the Illustrious, and his son Eupator; and the manifestations that came from heaven to them that behaved themselves manfully on the behalf of the Jews, so that, being but a few, they made themselves masters of the whole country, and put to flight the barbarous multitude; and recovered again the most renowned temple in all the world, and delivered the city, and restored the laws that were abolished, the Lord with all clemency showing mercy to them. *And all such things as have been comprised in five books by Jason of Cyrene, WE HAVE ATTEMPTED TO ABRIDGE IN ONE BOOK,*” &c. &c.

In this place, you observe, the author actually *confesses* that this 2nd book of Maccabees was nothing but *an abridgment of five books written by Jason of Cyrene!* Does this look like claiming inspiration, or rather, is it not a direct *disclaimer* on the part of the author? I think a person reading this book would soon find that it lacked internal evidence of its inspiration.

The next passage I shall cite is in the same book, the 15th chapter, 38th and 39th verses:—

“ So these things being done with relation to Nicanor, and from that time the city being possessed by the Hebrews, I also will here make an end of my narration. *Which if I have done well, and as it becometh the history, it is what I desired; but if not so perfectly, it must be pardoned me.*”

Now I ask you, Sir, and I ask this meeting, *does such language look like that of a man writing under the inspiration of God?* He writes a book, and at the close of it he makes an excuse for the imperfections of his history; he says, “ *If I have done well* (there was no assurance about the matter) and as it becometh the history, it is what I desired; but *if not so perfectly* (he appears to have had some misgivings) *it must be pardoned me!*” I think there is abundant internal evidence in this passage alone that the book was not inspired by God.

Let us turn now to the Prologue to the Book of Ecclesiasticus, and we shall discover evidence that the author of this book did not write under the inspiration of the Spirit of God:—

“ The knowledge of many and great things hath been shown us by the law and the prophets, and others that have followed them: for which things Israel is to be commended for doctrine and wisdom; because not only they that speak must needs be skilful, but strangers also, both speaking and writing, may by

their means become most learned. My grandfather, Jesus, *after he had given himself to a diligent reading of the law and the prophets, and other books, that were delivered to us from our fathers, HAD A MIND ALSO TO WRITE SOMETHING HIMSELF PERTAINING TO DOCTRINE AND WISDOM* ; that such as are desirous to learn, and are made knowing in these things, may be more and more attentive in mind, and be strengthened to live according to the law. I entreat you, therefore, to come with benevolence, and to read with attention, and to *pardon us for those things* in which we may seem, while we follow the image of wisdom, to come short in the composition of words ; for the Hebrew words have not the same force in them when translated into another tongue," &c. &c.

Here, first of all, this writer, alluding to the person who was the original author of the book, does not speak of him as professing to be under the inspiration of God, but merely says, "*he had a mind to write something,*" after having studied the law and the prophets. Then the individual that translates begs pardon for any faults or errors into which he may have fallen in translating the book into another tongue. So far for the Book of Ecclesiasticus.

Again, in the 9th chapter of the book of Judith, we find Judith coming forward and praying thus, in the 2nd and 3rd verses :—

" O Lord God of my father Simeon, who gavest him a sword to execute vengeance against strangers, who had defiled by their uncleanness, and uncovered the virgin unto confusion ; and who gavest their wives to be made a prey, and their daughters into captivity ; and all the spoils to be divided to thy servants, who were zealous with thy zeal ; assist, I beseech thee, O Lord God, me a widow."

The only use I want to make of this passage is, that in this book of Judith the fact of the destruction of the Shechemites is looked upon with approbation ; whereas, if you look at the 49th chapter of Genesis, you will find that Jacob condemned the murder ; so that, upon this matter of a moral nature this book seems to contradict the condemnation in the book of Genesis.

I may further call your attention to the 2nd book of Maccabees, the 14th chapter, 37th and following verses :—

" Now Razias, one of the ancients of Jerusalem, was accused to Nicanor, a man that was a lover of the city, and of good report, who for his affection was called the Father of the Jews. This man had for a long time held fast his purpose of keeping himself pure in the Jew's religion, and was ready to expose his body and life that he might persevere therein. So Nicanor being willing to declare the hatred that he bore the Jews, sent five hundred soldiers to take him. For he thought by ensnaring him to hurt the Jews very much. Now as the multitude sought to rush into his house, and to break open the door, and to set fire to it, when he was ready to be taken, *he struck himself with his sword ; CHOOSING TO DIE NOBLY* rather than to fall into the hands of the wicked, and to suffer abuses unbecoming his noble birth."

What do we find here ? *that suicide is actually commended and approved of !* It is not merely *the simple fact* which is *related*. This would be no proof against the in-

spiration of the book, for the inspired books of Scripture invariably, as I said yesterday, tell us of crimes and sins without number, and this only shews the faithfulness of their historical narrations. But where is there an instance, in the whole of those books that are generally acknowledged as divine, of the *approbation* of crime? Here, however, in this verse there is mention made of a crime distinctly opposed to the Decalogue, and yet it is *commended*! Razias is said to “*strike himself with his sword:*” and how does the writer comment on the act? His language with respect to it is, “CHOOSING TO DIE NOBLY.”! So that the *committing suicide* was *dying nobly*, in the estimation of this writer! Is that in accordance with the mind of God? Is that conformable to the law delivered on mount Sinai? Assuredly not. Therefore, *in the simple fact of the commendation of a sinful practice*, there is abundant *internal evidence* that this book could not have been inspired by God.

It is unnecessary for me to adduce any additional evidence at present respecting this matter. Mr. Brown, on the subject of internal evidence, has asked, “How can an individual reading the books which are called Apocryphal, and the other books which are generally received as divine, distinguish between them on the point of internal evidence?” I have shewn you, at all events, how easily he could find out that the Apocryphal books have no right to be reckoned in the canon of Scripture;—because Malachi intimates that the prophetic spirit should cease till the time of John the Baptist;—because these books contradict the acknowledged books of Scripture;—because immoral practices are approved of in them;—and because the writers disclaim rather than claim inspiration. Should there be still any doubt as to the *internal* evidence, remember that I have given you, besides this, a long chain of *external* evidence against these books. Thus the Apocrypha is destitute of either external or internal evidence in its favour, and, this being the case, we have established a very important fact, namely, that one portion of the Roman Catholic rule of faith has no foundation whatever: one portion, I say, for, be it remembered, that while the Church of Rome holds Scripture and Tradition as her rule of faith, she recognizes the Apocrypha *as part of the former*.

Now, Sir, I have adverted to the points which Mr. Brown adduced in his last speech; and as he confines me,

as much as possible, to the defence of my own rule, instead of allowing me to attack his in addition, I need not trespass longer on your attention, till more evidence be adduced against the sufficiency of the Protestant Rule of Faith.

---

THE REV. T. J. BROWN.

IN contending for Catholic doctrines, and against the Protestant Rule of Faith, I find myself involved in some difficulty as to the manner in which I had better proceed. I stated at the commencement of this discussion that I had a vast body of arguments to produce. The Rev. Gentleman on the opposite side has been seeking in various ways to lead me off from the course of my arguments; I have not got through by any means one half of what I purposed to adduce, and we have arrived at the third day of the discussion. If I answer his objections in detail, it will be impossible for me to fulfil the duty wherewith I am charged, of demonstrating that the Protestant rule is not sufficient. If I do not attend to the objections of the Rev. Gentleman opposite, he taunts me with shrinking from the difficulty. What, then, am I to do? I must be directed, for it is the only guide that I can have, by the agreement upon which we entered when we proposed this discussion; namely, that the first week should be allowed me to impugn the Protestant rule. I think it better, therefore, to go on with the arguments I have in store against it, and, accordingly, choosing the less of two evils, I must suffer some of the last-made objections to stand over for your future consideration. I have not, however, altogether passed by the objections of my opponents, nor is it my intention to do so. At present I shall cursorily notice a few of those which I consider the principal ones.

Mr. Tottenham commenced by stating that 2 Tim. iii. 14. gives satisfactory evidence that the Bible does contain all the necessary truths of religion, and that these are all contained even in the Old Testament; therefore, he argued, *a fortiori*, in the New Testament are *all things necessary for belief*. Christ, he added, came not to introduce a new religion, but to complete the old. I ask, then, Mr. Tottenham whether he is able to produce from the *Old*

*Testament* satisfactory evidence of the Trinity, of three equal Persons in one Godhead? This, I believe, will be admitted generally to be one of the most essential truths of Christianity. Will it be said that the Old Testament contains all things now necessary to salvation, whereas it does not contain distinctly this doctrine? You admit, most of you, the necessity of baptism. Is baptism expressed in the Old Testament? As it is not expressed in it, I wish to know whether the doctrine of baptism is not included amongst the necessary truths of the Christian religion? But there is delusion in such reasoning, and it has been attempted to be played off upon you throughout. There has not been that distinction kept up, which was requisite, between the *necessary* doctrines, that is, *essential* doctrines, without which a man *cannot be saved*, and other doctrines which are *not so essentially necessary, if they are not proposed*; but the rejection of *any one of which*, when duly proposed, excludes from salvation. Now the Catholic doctrine, concerning which I have repeatedly endeavoured to set right, not so much my hearers, as the Rev. Gentlemen, is, that all absolutely essential revelations are contained in the written word: but it cannot be proved that *all* the doctrines, *all and every one* of those truths which Christ came from heaven to reveal, and which he willed should be handed down to future ages, that all these are contained in the written word. You find, however, in Mark xvi. 16, that Christ does not limit our belief to any absolutely *essential* doctrines, regardless of disbelief in such as are not so absolutely essential; on the contrary he has declared, without any exception, to his Apostles: “Go, preach the *Gospel* to every creature”—(by the word *Gospel*, I told you, what no one who is acquainted with the force of the Greek term can be ignorant of, that Christ meant the *whole of the good tidings* which he came down from heaven to communicate)—“Go, preach the Gospel to every creature; he that believeth shall be saved, but *he that believeth not shall be damned*.” Here no distinction between sufficient or non-sufficient, essential or non-essential revelations is made by Christ; nor does it any where appear that all the revelations made by Christ to the Apostles, and intended for the edification of the Church in future times, are *one and all* contained in *Scripture*. I recommend this consideration to your serious attention. Attempts have been again and again made to lead you from the right view of the case.

With regard to difficulties about the Councils, and the

Catholics being at variance as to the place where infallibility resides, it is not necessary that I should enter into them, because they do not regard the point at issue,—*the Protestant rule*. Suffice it that I observe, that no Catholic feels any uneasiness as to where the infallibility of his Church exists, or what are the legitimate conditions of Councils. He has, in the promises of Christ, security for his faith, which is sufficient for him, and will be sufficient for any who shall embrace our doctrines. He will then have clearer proofs than I find it necessary now to give, how little is the obligation of acquainting himself with the utmost precision where is the seat of infallibility. Meanwhile, I will repeat what I stated yesterday, not, as Mr. T. imputed to me, that infallibility resides in the Church merely, but that it resides *in the body of pastors, in communion with their head*.

My opponent advanced that eight Councils were summoned, not by the Popes, whom we teach to be the visible head of the Church, but by the Emperors. The fact is, however, that the Emperors summoned certain Councils *in conjunction with the Pope*, but not one in opposition to him. Had they been so summoned, the doctrines proposed would not have been admitted by us, unless accepted by the subsequent approbation of the body of teachers and pastors. But I will tell you why the Popes exclusively did not summon certain Councils; it was because the holding of Councils was sometimes attended with immense expense, for which the Popes had not adequate funds, and which occasionally made necessary an appeal to the royal treasury; and because it was thought desirable that the Church and State should on certain occasions proceed hand in hand, a practice of which Mr. T. doubtless approves; consequently, it was by an *act of courtesy* that the Popes did not unnecessarily dispute with the Emperors concerning the convocation of those Councils. I might shew, however, that not only *no one* of the Councils was convoked in opposition to the will of the Pope, or without his approbation; but, moreover, that those who presided were in *no instance* the Emperor or his Officers, but *the Pope or his Legates*.

Mr. T. has endeavoured to get out of the difficulty in which he found he was involved by his declaration yesterday, that “the Bible was *not an object* of faith.” He maintains the same to-day; but what does he add? “I did not say that it was not necessary to receive the Bible as divine revelation, but that it is not an object of faith.”



I am unable to reconcile the contradiction in which my Rev. opponent appears to have involved himself. He does say that the Bible is *not an object of faith*, yet he does not say that the Bible is not to be believed *as divine*. But if it be not an object of faith, how is it to be *believed as divine*? If it be *believed as divine*, in that case I cannot conceive how it is not an object of faith. I am quite at a loss how to explain this inconsistency, and must wait for some further explanation.

Mr. Tottenham wishes to make you imagine that we are involved in the same difficulty as Protestants; that we can have no better security than they have, when we assent to the teaching of the Church. Were I to explain the manner in which an act of faith is formed by a child of Catholic principles, I should enter into details which I do not think necessary at present. I ought, however, to inform Mr. T. that there is a distinction, which is not attended to by him, between motives of credibility, and the testimony of God, upon which alone an act of divine faith can be founded. Motives of credibility must precede an act of faith. But the testimony of God is that upon which only an act of faith can be founded.

Thus, were God now to declare to me his existence, although it would, in the first place, be necessary for me to have sufficient motives of credibility for assuring myself that I am not deceived by my senses, yet it would not be because my sense of hearing testifies that God has declared he exists that I should believe with *divine faith* his existence. The *certain* testimony of my hearing is indeed the motive of credibility, whereby I am assured that the Almighty does testify to me his existence, in consequence of which, I submit to the word of God, and I produce an act of divine belief, *because God declares it*.

Thus, divine *faith* is founded *exclusively* upon the word of God, to which it is led by motives of credibility; and so it is with Catholics. We have, indeed, motives of credibility, assuring to us that the Bible contains the word of God: by motives of credibility we are led to admit the authority of his Church. Yet not on these, nor on mere moral certainty, does the Church propose to our faith the inspiration of the Bible. In advancing to an act of divine faith, in the inspiration of Scripture, we proceed thus:—The Scripture, *in the first instance*, is considered as an *authentic work*, without entering, as yet, upon the question of its inspiration. By the testimony of *this authentic Scrip-*



ture, we are assured that, according to the promise of the Son of God, his Church is gifted with infallibility by the Spirit of Truth. *This infallible Church then proposes to our belief, upon the declaration of God, the inspiration of the whole Scripture; and, accordingly, we believe in its inspiration, and in all its contents, by divine faith, the motive of which is the declaration of God contained in his unwritten word, proposed only by his unerring Church.* Thus our act of divine faith rests immediately and exclusively upon the testimony of the word of God. Mr. T. cannot show that the Protestant faith is so securely grounded.

Mr. T. has charged me with garbling a passage from Hooker. I can say with sincerity, however, that it was my wish to give it fairly. An author may be sometimes accidentally mis-quoted by any one: but those who know me know that no one more abhors an intentional mis-quotation. Accordingly, I have, over and over again, impressed upon those whom I have had to instruct in their theological studies, that they must carefully examine the whole context of a Protestant writer before they attempt to allege his testimony in support of Catholic principles.

It is objected to me that Hooker calls the authority of the Church merely *the first outward motive*. Now, instead of wishing to keep this out of sight, I really desired to call attention to it; for I still think that, since Hooker establishes thereby the authority of the Church, as the means by which the inspiration of Scripture is known, the quotation is not misapplied.

If, however, my Reverend opponent still thinks that I garbled the first passage, I beg to refer him to a second, which is decisive of the inconsistency of the Protestant rule concerning the matter in question:

“It is not the word of God which doth, or possibly can, assure us that we do well to think it is his word. For if any one book of Scripture did give testimony to all; yet still that Scripture which giveth credit to the rest, would require another Scripture to give credit to it: neither should we come unto any pause whereon to rest our assurance this way.”—Eccles. Polity, Book 2, n. 4, p. 109: Lond. 1705.

Mr. T. misrepresented me, moreover, when he said that I brought forward Hooker to overthrow internal evidence. It was not with reference to internal evidence that I alleged his authority: on that point I quoted from the “*Theologia Christiana*,” of Limborch.

Mr. T. has entered into a long discussion on the authenticity of the Apocrypha, into which he says that I led him,

by inviting any one to examine the book which he terms Apocryphal. How often have I to point out to you misrepresentations of my words. It is not correct, then, that I invited *any one* to examine the Apocrypha; for, by proposing to enter into such an examination, I should have given my opponents the wished-for advantage of quitting the prescribed topic of controversy. What I did propose was, that we should make an experiment of the internal evidence of Scripture, by bringing forward into the assembly any Protestant, *not deeply read in the written word*, and that I would defy *such a one*, by any internal evidence, to distinguish the prophecy of Baruch, which we admit as inspired, and you reject, from the prophecy of Jeremiah, which is admitted by all. I will not enter further into the question, because I will not consume any more valuable time upon it, but go on with my arguments against the Protestant Rule of Faith.

My present object is to convince you of your inconsistency, by showing that whilst you profess to believe that all revealed truths are contained in Scripture, you do at the same time admit several divine doctrines which cannot be shewn to be contained therein. It will be with regret that I shall say any thing mortifying to the feelings of my friends present; but I am sure that they will pardon me, considering the necessity imposed upon me of advocating my religion.

I have already proved that the canonicity of the books of Scripture, and their inspiration, cannot be established but by the authority of the Church supported by tradition; that is, the authority of the Church must be the chief motive of credibility; but the unerring word of God, manifested by tradition, must be the immediate motive upon which your act of divine faith is formed. In confirmation of these positions, I adduced the authority of some Protestant divines of eminence.

I shall now pass on to another point. Few of you will deny that baptism is a matter of divine institution, and, therefore, a matter of the highest consequence to every one. Accordingly, in the Catechism in your book of Common Prayer, I find the following questions and answers:

“Who gave you this name?” “My godfathers and godmothers in my baptism, wherein I was made a *member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.*” . . . . “How many sacraments hath Christ ordained in his Church?” “Two only, as *generally necessary to salvation*, that is to say *baptism* and the supper of the Lord.”

Here baptism is declared to be of essential consequence to Protestants, and to be a sacrament that is generally *necessary to salvation*. Now turn to the 27th of the 39 Articles—“The baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.” Whence know you, my friends, that the baptism of *young infants* is most agreeable with the institution of Christ? Is it from Scripture? Then let the passage be quoted. But when I search the Scriptures in the exercise of that right which the Reformation Society concedes to the meanest outcast of society of putting his interpretation upon the word of God, *I am unable to find any declaration of Scripture*, showing that it is most agreeable to the institution of Christ, that baptism should be conferred on *young infants*. Let us observe the language of the sacred volume—“Go ye, therefore,” said Christ to his Apostles, “and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” Matt. xxviii. 19.—“He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned.” Mark xvi. 16.—“Then Peter said unto them: *Repent* and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.” Acts ii. 38.—From these passages it follows that, admitting no Rule of Faith besides Scripture, baptism can be conferred upon adults only, since instruction and repentance must precede it; and I nowhere find any declaration of the written word of God which authorizes me to believe that the baptism of *infants* is conformable with the institution of that sacrament by Jesus Christ. Upon what then is such belief founded?

I may be told, possibly, that the baptism of infants is a matter of *discipline only*. Yes; after you shall have satisfied yourselves by your only rule, the written word, that Christ willed baptism to be administered indifferently to adults and infants, then it may become a matter of discipline, whether it be administered in infancy, or in advanced years. But we are not speaking on any such point of mere discipline. Is it not, I ask, in the first place, *an article of faith*, at all events, amongst the members of the Established Church, that *the baptism of infants is lawful*? Upon what is that *doctrine of faith* founded? But, 2ndly, if you tell me that it is not a doctrine of faith, I ask, what right have you to administer baptism to infants, instead of deferring it till they come to that age when the Scripture *evidently* declares, that it entitles them to be made heirs of the king-

dom of God? Unless you have the security of God's word that baptism, before the use of reason, is available to sanctification, you cannot be justified in giving baptism to infants; or, in not repeating it, at least, when they come to years of discretion. I am sure that not one of you who has been baptized in infancy can have any tranquillity of mind, unless you believe, *not as being a matter of opinion only*, but as manifested by the *clear declaration of God's word*, that the baptism of infants is available to salvation. I shall be told, perhaps, that in 1 Cor. i. 16, it is said that St. Paul baptized *the household* of Stephanus, some of which you will argue were infants. This, however, amounts to a mere conjecture; but conjecture will not suffice to satisfy any one on the validity of infant baptism, whilst the word of God appears to be expressly against it. Moreover, as in St. John iv. 43, the text—"himself *believed*, and his *whole house*," does not include infants, for they were incapable of belief, why should the preceding text include them?

I will now show you that several distinguished Protestants have conceded this point. But first allow me to quote from St. Augustine, who, in his 10th Book De Genes. ab litt. cap. 22, writes—

"The custom of the Church in baptizing infants, would not be at all deserving of belief, *were it not a point of Apostolical tradition.*" Ed. Ben. tom. 3, p. 272.

Origen, a very early writer, in his 5th book, c. 9, on the Epistle to the Romans, says:—

"The Church hath derived its tradition from the Apostles of giving baptism even to infants."

Now for Protestant authority. The eminent Jeremy Taylor, in his book "Episcopacy Asserted," section 19, argues:—

"Baptism of infants is of ordinary necessity to all that ever cried, and yet the Church hath founded this rite *upon the tradition of the Apostles*. And wise men do easily observe, that the Anabaptists can *by the same probability of Scripture*, enforce a necessity of communicating infants upon us, as we do of baptizing upon them, if we speak of immediately divine institution or of practice Apostolical *recorded in Scripture*; and therefore a great Master of Geneva, in a book he writ against the Anabaptists, was forced to fly to *apostolical tradition*; and they that deny this, are by the just anathema of the Catholic Church, confidently condemned as *for heretics.*"—"The fourth kind of tradition, is the continued practice of such, as neither are contained in the Scripture expressly, nor the example of such practice expressly there delivered; of this sort is the baptism of infants, which is therefore named *a tradition*; because it is not expressly delivered in the Scripture, that the Apostles did baptize infants, nor is any express precept there found." Dr. Field's Book of the Ch. L. 4. c. 20.

I might go on with a long list of Protestant authorities. I hold a work in my hand, published by a Protestant divine, entitled "A Complete Collection of Devotions, taken from the Apostolical Constitutions, the Ancient Liturgies, and the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England." The third part, called "An Appendix," &c. consists entirely of extracts from Protestant writers of eminence in proof of tradition, amongst which are many express testimonies that the baptism of infants is derived from tradition only; but this being the last day for discussing "the Rule of Faith," want of time forbids me to quote any more Protestant testimonies. Already I have given you the sentiments of men of great eminence amongst you. I shall be glad to hear, in opposition to them, upon what authority besides that of *tradition*, is the baptism of infants to be established, so as to be a *matter of faith*, and not of *opinion* only; for we must keep wholly distinct *faith* and *opinion*.

I now proceed to another point. If Scripture be the only rule of divine faith, I ask you again, how you reconcile with Scripture baptism by *aspersion*, or the pouring on of water, instead of baptism by *immersion*? Looking at your Book of Common Prayer, under the head "Administration of Public Baptism of Infants," the rubric says:

"But if they certify that the child is weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it, saying the foresaid words:"

This likewise must be not a matter of *opinion*, but of *divine faith*; otherwise, if you have no assurance of the validity of such baptism founded upon the word of God, you must be guilty of great impiety in not closely adhering to the only rite according to which Christ instituted this sacrament, as it is recorded in Scripture. Now, if we look *to Scripture only*, we must be satisfied that there is no *valid* manner of conferring baptism *except by immersion*. I prove it from the words of Christ, who prescribed to his Apostles that they should "*baptize* all nations, teaching them," &c. The word in the original Greek, used by the Evangelists is βαπτίζειν, and this word signifies washing by *immersion* only, and not by the *pouring on of water*, or *aspersion*. This interpretation is sustained by the authority of the most eminent Greek scholars, even Protestants. Casaubon, Camerarius, Grotius, Hammond, Valpy, Parkhurst, and others all declare this to be the meaning, and the only meaning in which Scripture employs this term. There-

fore, by *Scripture* no other mode of administering baptism is ordained but by *immersion*; and baptism by sprinkling or pouring of water is authorized only by the unwritten word. I find again, if we look for the mysterious signification of baptism, that St. Paul describes it thus :

“ Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death ? Therefore *we are buried* with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.” Rom. vi. 3 and 4.

Now the mysterious signification is manifest in baptism by immersion : but, this death of the old man, and resurrection of the new man, this mystical meaning is not found clearly in baptism by sprinkling, or by the pouring on of water. Again, if we look to the practice of the primitive ages, we find that baptism by immersion was the only usual mode of baptism, even down to the 13th century, and in the Greek Church even to the present time.

I conclude, then, that if we are to be guided by *Scripture* only, if the Bible is the only Rule of Faith, that sect which has departed from the Established Church, or rather which existed before the Established Church in other countries, the sect of the Baptists, and which differs from the doctrine of the Established Church on this important point, triumphs ; and if there are any Baptists in this room, I tell them that by the literal meaning of *Scripture*, they are right in administering baptism to none but adults, and by immersion only ; and I defy their adversaries to prove the contrary by the authority of *Scripture* alone. This becomes more evident by the candid concession of the Protestant author of the “ Second Answer to Bossuet’s Exposition of Catholic Faith :”

“ Aspersions corrupts, in some measure, the sacrament of baptism, and is an abuse which we are resolved henceforward to correct.”

The Protestants of the Established Church must indeed correct the abuse, or alter their Rule of Faith, and admit beside *Scripture the unwritten word*.

It is extraordinary that there should be so much inconsistency amongst the opponents of Catholics, between their rule of faith and their doctrine on practical points of the highest importance. What can be of higher importance than the validity of baptism ? Now I find that besides the cases which I have mentioned, there is another of great moment, arising from the circumstances under which baptism is sometimes conferred, and wherein the Protestant practice cannot be warranted by the written word, but

*by tradition only.* You admit baptism by heretics; nay, you admit the validity of baptism when conferred by those whom you call *apostates* and *idolaters*; for you admit the validity of baptism by Catholic ministers, as you admit the validity of their ordinations. Let Protestants assign the texts of Scripture whereby it is proved that baptism by heretics, or by any others than the legitimate ministers of the gospel, is *valid*. The commission which Christ gave was addressed to the Apostles only. Whence, then, do you know that heretics, nay, that *apostates* and *idolaters* are warranted in administering valid baptism? If Protestants can discover it, St. Augustine could not, who was as well versed in Scripture as the members of the Reformation Society. Listen to what he says, L. 5. De Baptismo, C. 23.

“The Apostles have left us no precept on that matter (the validity of baptism by heretics). But we must, however, believe, that the custom opposed to St. Cyprian derived its origin from apostolical tradition. In like manner many things are observed in the Universal Church, and therefore are rightly believed to have been ordained by the Apostles, though we find nothing of them in writing.” Ed. Ben. tom. 9. p. 156.

Again, in L. 2. chap. 7, he writes,—

“This custom, I believe, descended from apostolical tradition, like many other things which are not found in the writings of the Apostles, nor in the subsequent Councils, and nevertheless, because they are held by the Universal Church, are believed to be delivered and recommended by them.” Tom. 9. p. 102.

Here is an authority in the early ages assigning a very different rule of faith from that introduced 300 years ago. There was another celebrated writer who flourished before St. Augustine, the great St. Cyprian. So little could *he* discover in Scripture the validity of baptism by heretical ministers, that he held out against the general sentiment of the Church, which had not decided the controversy in his time, that there was no proof thereof in Scripture, nor proof in tradition; for *he* appealed to tradition likewise, not being aware at that time that tradition was clear on the other side. It was not discoverable from Scripture to the whole Church of Africa; for St. Cyprian not being able to find in Scripture any warrant or authority for baptism by heretics, assembled the third Council of Carthage, which together with many of the oriental bishops refused to subscribe to that doctrine. But were it clear in the written word, St. Cyprian and the bishops of his opinion would have discovered it, as well as any members of the Reformation Society.

There are several other similar inconsistencies, upon



which want of time does not permit me to enlarge as I have done upon those above; but I will only cursorily mention them, that you may consider them at your leisure. The doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the *Father and the Son*, is a doctrine which the members of the Protestant Established Church are bound to admit as an article of faith, and from which they cannot escape; for they acknowledge the Nicene and the Athanasian Creeds, both of which proclaim this doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son; and in reciting the Athanasian Creed they do declare it is an article of *divine faith*, and that moreover the man who does not subscribe to it cannot be saved. Now the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son cannot be established from Scripture only. Our adversaries may bring forward certain passages that may entitle them to affirm it as a matter of *opinion*, but they cannot establish it as an article of *faith*. This becomes strikingly manifest to you when you look at the whole Greek Church, which separates itself from the Catholic Church upon this very point, because they could not discover in Scripture any clear proofs that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son.

Another difficulty is the divine institution of Episcopacy. The members of the Established Church are bound to hold its divine institution. I expected, when I agreed upon this discussion, that I should have found here Mr. Shanks, a minister of the Kirk of Scotland, and delegate of the Reformation Society, who does not hold that doctrine, and I thought that I might have had an opportunity of relieving its tediousness by inviting you to hearken to his arguments from the Protestant only rule of faith, against the divine right of Episcopacy, and to Mr. T.'s, from the same rule, in proof of that divine right. In my opinion, Mr. Shanks would have had the advantage. Indeed, Jeremy Taylor, in his work, entitled *Episcopacy Asserted*, has brought his proofs almost exclusively from the *traditions* of the Church. Why has he done this? Because he found that he was not able to stand upon any other foundation than the doctrine of tradition, manifested by the authority of the Church.

Baptism by lay persons is also admitted, if not by the articles and rubrics of the Established Church, yet by its ablest divines. I have looked at many of their theological works, and find them holding the validity of baptism

by laymen. Now this is another point which cannot be established by the written word.

Again, in the 15th chapter of the Acts, there is recorded, by St. Luke, this solemn declaration of the Apostles assembled in council at Jerusalem:—"It seemed good *to the Holy Ghost* and to us . . . . that ye abstain from blood, and from things strangled." When, therefore, in contradiction to this express prohibition of Scripture, Protestants partake of strangled meat or blood, they must rest on tradition only. I cannot enter into the arguments which authorize this conclusion, but must refer those that are disposed to consider them to a dissertation after the 15th chapter of Acts, in Dr. A. Clarke's commentaries on the Holy Scriptures, where they will find this question handled at length by Dr. Delaney, and proofs, from the time of the Apostles to the present day, adduced for the continuance of the prohibition, the obligation of which cannot be consistently removed, except by the authority of tradition. Moreover, if your faith rests exclusively on the written word, why do you not admit, in your rite of administering the Lord's Supper, all those ceremonies which we find were observed by our divine Saviour *in the Scripture*; for, if Scripture is to be the *only rule* of faith—if tradition is not to be introduced as explaining its obscurity—you will not be able to show by what right you depart from those ceremonies. It is *by tradition only* that you will be able to establish the lawfulness of your proceeding. If it be argued that these are matters of discipline, I request to be informed, from Scripture, by what clear rule you distinguish between faith and discipline in such matters?

Moreover, by your principles you cannot, in direct opposition to Scripture, alter *the discipline instituted by it*? How, then, do you prove the lawfulness of the change of the Sabbath from the day prescribed in the old law? By the Fourth Commandment the Sabbath was to be observed on the seventh day of the week; you keep the Sabbath upon the first day of the week: and Dr. Brett, a Protestant, in his "Tradition Necessary," p. 27, observes that, those who speak

"most contemptibly of tradition pretend the highest zeal for the veneration of Sunday, though it is utterly impossible, without a miracle, to say which day is Sunday, but by tradition only."

Another point, upon which you are guided by tradition, in your practice, is the omitting of the washing of feet,

which is prescribed by Christ, in John, xiii. 14, 15, wherein he declares,

“ If I then your Lord and Master have washed your feet ; ye also ought to wash one another’s feet. For I have given you an example, *that ye should do as I have done to you.*”

That herein, likewise, you depend upon tradition only, I could confirm, if it were not that my time is too much limited, by the declarations of distinguished Protestants.

Now this Catholic doctrine of tradition is not borne out by Protestants only, but by the authority of the most eminent of the early writers. In the first place, I appeal to the authority of St. Ignatius, the disciple of the Apostles Peter and John, who must have known distinctly, if any one could, what were the doctrines handed down by the Apostles relative to the rule of faith ; whether the Scriptures were the *only rule* of faith, or whether we are to look to tradition as a portion of that rule, and to the authority of the Church for the expounding of it. Moreover, at the time when St. Ignatius wrote, the Apostles were dead ; therefore the objection cannot be urged that, during the Apostles’ life-time only, it was not necessary that everything should be written. Now, of Ignatius, the disciple of Peter, and his successor in the chair of Antioch, it is recorded in the Church History of Eusebius, L. 3, cap. 36, that,—

“ As he was led through Asia, by his persecutors, he admonished the Christians to beware of the false doctrines of Heretics, and to adhere tenaciously to the tradition of the Apostles : *which, for the sake of security, he deemed necessary, when on the eve of martyrdom, to commit to writing.*”

This passage has been found exceedingly strong. What do our opponents do ?

Some time since, I discovered that Dr. Fulke, a divine of the Church of England, in his “ Defence of the English Translations of the Bible,” p. 29, for the sake of deluding his Protestant readers, perverts the words, “ which (tradition), for the sake of security, he deemed necessary, when on the eve of martyrdom, to commit to writing,” thus, “ which, *by that time*, he protested *to be committed to writing ;*” as if it had been already committed to writing by the Apostles. But were this the meaning of St. Ignatius, there would be an absurdity in *his calling* the doctrines, to which he exhorted the Christians to adhere, by the name of *tradition*, any more than all the other portions of the New Testament which had been written. Besides, a manifest proof of Fulke’s corrupt translation will be conspi-

cuous to any person who shall consult the original Greek. Let him open also the Latin versions of Eusebius, and he will find that even Protestants dare not support Fulke's translation. I have consulted Valesius, and he translates the passage as I have done. I have also consulted the Protestant translators, Musculus and Grynæus, and they render it in the same manner. I contend, therefore, that in the first ages, when the sentiments of the Apostles were well known, before the expiration of one hundred years after the death of Jesus Christ, the doctrine of the rule of faith was not Scripture only, but also *the unwritten word*. It was the same in the century following. Tertullian thus expresses himself concerning a certain difficulty which had arisen :—

“ If Scripture has herein defined nothing, surely usage has, which usage has arisen from tradition.” De Coronâ, c. 3. p. 101. Ed. Rigalt. 1675.

Some objected, however, that even tradition ought to rest on written authority. In reply, Tertullian writes, that he will allow the force of the objection —

“ If no other practices can be adduced, which we maintain *on the exclusive title of tradition, without any written authority whatsoever.*” L. c.

And he proceeds to enumerate several such practices, observed upon the authority of tradition only, amongst which were *prayers and sacrifices for the dead*, which I am sure our adversaries will not say are matters of mere discipline, but appertaining to doctrines of faith. Therefore, by these two Fathers (in the course of my arguments I have quoted others, and could produce many more, did not want of time restrain me), the practice and doctrine of the first ages is directly in contradiction to the Protestant doctrine, which has been established during 300 years only. Assuredly the first ages were much better qualified to judge of the real meaning of the Apostolical doctrine than those who came into existence 1500 years after the establishment of the Rule of Faith.

REV. JOHN LYONS.

MR. CHAIRMAN,—Ladies and Gentlemen,—I should not have come forward to answer Mr. Brown, were I not obliged immediately afterwards to leave this meeting, in order to return to my own ministerial duties.

The Rev. Gentleman has given me much matter to answer, and at the same time has given a singular picture of tradition. You heard it often declared by my Rev. friend, Mr. Tottenham, that tradition was placed above Scripture by the Church of Rome, and I think my Rev. opponent has given you a very happy commentary on that expression. I find my Rev. opponent saying, and he quotes Scripture in support of his assertion, that he has learned “that repentance must precede baptism,” and “that teaching must go before baptism.” He says that he is taught these things out of Scripture; but then tradition teaches him that a person is not to be taught before baptism: here are tradition and Scripture clashing one with the other. Scripture, Mr. Brown says, teaches one thing, the tradition of his Church teaches another: by Scripture he is taught that repentance should go before baptism—from tradition he learns that it should not. How can the Rev. Gentleman reconcile these contradictions, and make Scripture and tradition both the word of God? But again he tells us that there was no manner “of baptism lawful according to Scripture but by immersion.” It appears by the Church of Rome’s practice that she sprinkles infants—pours water on them—and here again we have tradition and Scripture directly opposed the one to the other. But the Rev. Gentleman tells us that baptism by immersion was practised even down to the 13th century: here we have the Church of Rome acting contrary to the practice of the Church during 13 ages; so that it appears that the tradition by which she learned that infants were to be sprinkled, and not immersed, lay hid in the dust of ages for 13 centuries. Here then we have tradition opposed to the Holy Scriptures—opposed to the primitive Church—and opposed to the practice of 13 centuries.

But the Rev. Gentleman put a question respecting the proofs of the doctrine of the Trinity being contained in the Old Testament. It is rather singular to put questions of this kind, when it is well known to all persons acquainted

with Jewish Synagogues, where the Law is read every Sabbath-day, that the descendants of Abraham believe that there is a Trinity of persons in the unity of the God-head: that doctrine is acknowledged to this day amongst them. But we shall come to the word of God. In the prophecy of Isaiah, at the 48th chap. you find three persons distinctly mentioned, and these three persons bearing the name of JEHOVAH. In the 16th verse it is said:—

“Come ye near unto me, and hear this, I have not spoken in secret from the beginning: from the time before it was done, I was there, and now the Lord God hath sent me, and his Spirit.”

Here we have three persons,—the Lord God—his Spirit—and the Being who was sent.

Revert to the 12th verse, and you will learn who the Being is who was sent:—

“Hearken to me, O Jacob, and thou Israel whom I called, I am he—I am the FIRST and I am the LAST”—

—The title of JEHOVAH in the Old Testament, and the title of the Lord Jesus Christ in the book of Revelations;—and yet here “the first and the last,” is said to be sent by the Lord God, and by his Spirit. Here then we have the Three Persons clearly revealed to us in this chapter. But again I must send the Rev. Gentleman to the 18th of Genesis, and let him turn to St. Augustine’s commentary on that chapter, where he will find that Father saying that the three angels were the three persons of the God-head.

Rev. T. J. BROWN.—Please to give it correctly. He does not say so.

Rev. JOHN LYONS.—I should say, to Cyril of Alexandria’s first book against Julian, where that Father thinks that there was a representation of the Trinity;—for Abraham speaks to them in verse 3 as if “the three were but one.”

Mr. Brown says that the procession of the Holy Ghost is not to be found in Scripture. It is very odd, that when it is written in the Douay Bible, he could not discover it. In the Gospel of St. John, chap. 15, verse 26, it is said:—

“But when the Paraclete cometh, whom I will send you from the Father, the Spirit of Truth, who PROCEEDETH from the Father, he shall give testimony of me.”

There is the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father. The Rev. Gentleman says, “it is not to be found in Scrip-

ture,” and here we find it written in his own Bible; and the note appended to it is this:—

“ This proves, against the modern Greeks, that the Holy Ghost *proceedeth from the Son* as well as from the Father: *otherwise he could not be sent by the Son.*”

Here is the procession of the Paraclete from the Father;—the text asserts he is sent by the Son, and therefore the argument is he must PROCEED from the Son also. In the Douay Bible we have thus the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and from the Son.

The Rev. Gentleman also adverted to the “ courtesy ” of certain Popes, who acted most courteously indeed towards the Emperors. They received from the Emperors as much money as they required, and when by means of this largess they obtained power, they then put the Emperors under their feet, and trampled upon them, and this was “ the courtesy ” which the Emperors received from them in after ages.

Mr. Brown asked yesterday, and he has frequently asked the same at different times of this discussion, that we should produce the command of the Lord Jesus Christ that Holy Scripture was to be written. I produced several commands in the book of the Revelation from the Lord Jesus to John that he was to write; but all these quotations were “ mere childish arguments ”—unworthy of being answered. I can only reply in the words of Holy Scripture, as contained in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, that—

“ God chooses the foolish things of this world that he may confound the wise: and the weak things of the world hath God chosen that he may confound the strong: and the base things of the world and the things that are contemptible hath God chosen, and things that are not, that he might bring to nought things that are: that no flesh should glory in his sight.”

But I am afraid that I misunderstood Mr. Brown yesterday, when, after I sat down, and he had disposed of all my assertions, in a moment of time, he then declared that no such persons as Jansenists——

Rev. T. J. BROWN.—That is not the way *you* pronounced it.

Rev. JOHN LYONS.—Then it is a mere play upon words?

Rev. T. J. BROWN.—I said not only that there were no such persons as *Jangenists*, but that no such persons were members of the Catholic Church.

Rev. JOHN LYONS.—If I said *Jangzenists*, it was a mis-



take in the pronunciation, and I am sorry that I offended Mr. Brown's delicate sense of hearing by such an error; but when I coupled them with Jansenius, a Romish Bishop, he must have known what I meant, the more especially as two or three Popes were engaged in the controversy,—as Jansenius was Bishop of Ypres, and the controversy was carried on so long, that it required several Papal Bulls to put a termination to it. I am sorry, however, that I offended him by a mispronunciation.

Mr. Brown has asked me to produce some doctrinal corruptions in the Douay Bible;—he says those I produced yesterday were mere verbal variations. I produced them yesterday to shew the great value attached to the authorized version by members of the Church of Rome, *in making their own version so closely resemble ours*. Now I shall bring him to some corruptions in his own book, and *corruptions in doctrines*, not in words.

In the 3rd chap. of the book of Genesis, and the 15th verse, it is said:—

“I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed, **SHE** shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for **HER** heel.”

There is a word inserted here that is not to be found in the Hebrew text, and yet the title-page tells me that this Bible is translated from the Latin Vulgate diligently, compared with the Hebrew, Greek, and other editions in different languages. In the Hebrew, the word signifies “**IT**,” or “**HE**,” referring to “seed,” and not “**SHE**.” It is in this Bible, “**SHE** shall crush thy head.” Here is a doctrinal corruption; for what is the use generally made of this translation of the word in the Church of Rome? It is to exalt the power of the Virgin Mary, and make her as the last Papal Bull hath made her, “the sole foundation,” “the patroness” and protectress of the Church of Rome. But it is here said, “she shall bruise thy head;”—whose head was to be bruised? it was Satan's head—that is, it was “the works of the devil that were to be destroyed,” for the devil had brought the creature into subjection under him, and never could man rise against Satan, and crush his head by creature power. It is a prophecy concerning the Lord Jesus Christ, declaring that the God-Man,—he who “is God over all,” should take our nature upon him, and come into this world “to destroy the works of the devil,” “to make an end of sin,” and “to bring in an everlasting righteousness” for his own people.

But again, in the Epistle to the Hebrews there is another doctrinal corruption. In the 11th chapter of that Epistle, and the 21st verse:—

“By faith Jacob dying blessed each of the sons of Joseph, and adored the top of his rod.”

Here this translation makes Jacob an *idolator* before the Lord, “*ADORING the top of his rod.*” But we know the use that is made of this; it is in order to sanction the Church of Rome in her adoration of images, as the note appended shews us. The note says—

“In paying a relative honour and veneration to the top of the rod or sceptre of Joseph, as to a figure of Christ’s sceptre and kingdom.”

I now pass to another doctrinal corruption contained in the 2nd Epistle of Peter, the 1st chapter and 10th verse,

“Wherefore brethren labour the more, that by good works ye may make sure your calling and election.”

The words “good works” are not to be found in any Greek copies of authority; the Church of Rome inserts the words “good works” because she depends so much upon “works,” and therefore desires to have some verse in the Word of God to support her. Here, then, is another doctrinal corruption opposed to the whole Scripture, and to the honour of the living God, that “by our good works we are to make our calling and election sure.”

You will see a parallel passage to this in the 13th of Hebrews, and the 16th verse,—

“And do not forget to do good and to impart, for by such sacrifices God’s favour is obtained.”

Here again is another departure from the Greek, in order to support that doctrine of a mixture of faith and works, which is held in the Church of Rome as the ground of the sinner’s salvation.

But let us compare two of their Bibles; first the Bible brought out by Pope Sixtus the Fifth, and then another by Pope Clement the Eighth. We have been told that there were 2831 errors in the Protestant Bible. In Dr. James’s *Bellum Papale*, it is shewn that there were upwards of 2000 errors in the “*Infallible Bible*” of Pope Sixtus the Fifth,—it was so corrupt that Pope Clement the Eighth was obliged to put it aside altogether, and bring out a new edition. I shall advert only to one passage to shew the difference in the two Bibles. The 2nd Epistle of Peter, the 1st chapter, and the 16th verse, is translated in the Douay Bible,—

“We have not followed cunningly devised fables.”

In Pope Sixtus the Fifth's Bible the word translated here "cunningly devised" is "*Indoctas*," but in Pope Clement the Eighth's Bible he strikes the "*in*" from the word, and reads it "*doctas*." Here are two words as opposed in meaning as they can be. In one copy it would be—"We have not followed *unlearned* fables." In the other—"We have not followed *learned* fables." Here are two infallible heads unable to agree in the translation of a simple Greek word.

The Reverend Gentleman has asked us to prove the inspiration of the Epistles to Timothy and Philemon. It is rather unhappy, in a member of the Church of Rome, to ask any question about the inspiration of the Epistles to Timothy. I trust that the Reverend Gentleman will not treat me as a Scripture Reader was lately treated in Ireland, being bound over to keep the peace for reading to a Priest the portion of one of these Epistles that I am now about to read to you, the Priest having assevered that he was put in terror of his life by the reading thereof. These are the words:—

"Now the Spirit manifestly saith, that in the last times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to spirits of error, and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, and having their conscience seared, forbidding to marry, to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving by the faithful, and by them that have known the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be rejected that is received with thanksgiving: for it is sanctified by the Word of God and prayer."—1 Tim. iv. 1—4.

When there exists a Church amongst us that forbids us to marry, and commands to abstain from meats, more especially at the present season, we need have no doubt of the inspiration of the 1st Epistle to Timothy.

I now proceed to propose, briefly, some few arguments in favour of the perfection of the Holy Scriptures.

The Apostle Paul gives us to understand that he committed to writing that which he had spoken. In the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, the 11th chapter and the 23d verse, he saith—

"For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you." Now, if this word "delivered" were translated literally, it would be "traditioned" unto you. He then goes on to WRITE the things that he had "traditioned" or spoken unto them. Again, in the 15th chapter the 1st and 2nd verses:

"Now I make known to you, brethren, the Gospel which I preached to you, which also you have received and wherein you stand: By which also you are saved, if you hold fast after what manner I preached unto you, unless you have believed in vain."

In these verses the Apostle distinctly tells us that the Gospel which he had preached, and which also they had received, he “*now*” made known unto them. He *now writes* that very gospel which he had spoken to them; and what does he tell them with regard to that which he had formerly preached to them? He says, “By which also ye are saved.” Thus, by the written Word of God—by what the Apostle Paul preached, and afterwards wrote, we can be saved. This is all we contend for, that “the Holy Scriptures can instruct to salvation through faith, which is in the Lord Jesus Christ.”

The Reverend Gentleman has said, that the Bible is *the object* of our faith—this we deny—we have no object of faith but one, the Lord Jesus Christ. But the Bible teaches us what we are to believe respecting Jesus, what we are to know and feel respecting ourselves—it opens to us the path to immortality—it dissipates the clouds of spiritual darkness, and shews us the undimmed rays of light and beauty which fall from the face of Jesus, “who is the image of God,” on a sinner’s soul. Wherefore, we say it is only through faith in Christ, that the Scriptures can make us “wise unto salvation”—they are the means, but the great object of Protestant faith is Jesus—and Jesus only.

But the Apostle Peter seems to have had no knowledge of any revelation beyond the written Word; in the 3rd chapter of his 2nd Epistle, he thus writes:—

“As also in all his Epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are certain things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures to their own destruction.” v. 16.

St. Peter acknowledges only *the Epistles* of St. Paul—he acknowledges only the *written word* of the Old Testament—there is no mention whatever of *tradition* when he thus speaks respecting the Epistles of St. Paul.

You will recollect a verse that the Reverend Gentleman quoted from the 1st of Acts, wherein we are told that Christ spake to his disciples for forty days, after he rose from the dead, and he tells us that secret things were then whispered into the ears of the Apostles, which they put into the ears of the Church, and that the Church has carried them down to the present day. Now it appears that the Apostle John did not keep these “secrets” to himself, but committed them to WRITING, for, in his 1st Epistle, it is said,—

“That which we have SEEN and have HEARD we declare unto you, . . . and these things we WRITE unto you that your joy may be full.” chap. 1. v. 3. & 4.

And what he had seen and heard he tells us in the first verse :—

“That which was from the beginning, WHICH WE HAVE HEARD, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the word of life—That we declare unto you.”

The way that he declared it was not by tradition, but by writing under the infallible direction of the Holy Spirit—

“These things WE WRITE to you.”—v. 4.

But again, when I desire to see the perfection of Holy Scripture, I turn to that part of the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles to which the Rev. Gentleman has referred, to the account of that meeting which is commonly called the “Council of Jerusalem.” How is the subject in debate settled by the Council? Different members stood up and spoke; and finally James arose, and closed with these words :—

“To this agree the words of the Prophets, AS IT IS WRITTEN.”—v. 15, &c.

The written word of God—the words of the Prophets—are adduced, to try whether the things which had been spoken in the previous part of the Council “were right and fitting words;” and then he quotes two passages from the Old Testament Scriptures. This was the way the Apostles managed a controversy wherein doubtful matters came before them. They deliver their opinions on one side and on the other, and then try do these “agree with the words of the Prophets, as it is written?”

In the 18th Psalm, in the Douay edition (the 19th in the authorized Version), it is written, in the 8th and following verses,—

“The law of the Lord is unspotted, converting souls; the testimony of the Lord is faithful, giving wisdom to little ones. The justices of the Lord are right, rejoicing hearts: the commandment of the Lord is lightsome, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the Lord is holy, enduring for ever and ever: the judgments of the Lord are true, justified in themselves.”

In our translation, according to the Hebrew, it is—

“The law of the Lord is PERFECT, converting souls.”

In the 2nd Epistle to the Corinthians, the 7th chap. and the 1st verse, it is written—

“Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of the flesh and of the spirit, perfecting sanctification in the fear of God.”

From the 18th Psalm, you heard that “the perfect law of the Lord is able to convert the soul.” Here we read, that the same law of the Lord is able to perfect sanctification in the fear of God. Now, a thing which

is imperfect in itself cannot produce perfection in another. Although the Church of Rome has discovered that 300 fallibles can make one infallible, we have not yet arrived at such a point in discovery. What are the words by means of which we are to perfect sanctification in the fear of the Lord? Revert to the last three verses of the 6th chap. of this 2nd Epistle, and you will there read quotations from the written word containing these promises, “by which we are to perfect sanctification in the fear of God.” Here are two passages, the one referring to the conversion, and the other ascribing the sanctification, of the children of God to the instrumentality of the written word.

Again, in the 26th chap. of the Acts of the Apostles, and the 17th verse, are these words:—

“Delivering thee from the people and from the nations unto which I now send thee, to open their eyes, that they may be converted from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and a lot among the Saints by the faith that is in me.”

Here the enlightening of the eyes—the conversion from darkness to light—the bringing from under the power of Satan to God—the receiving of the forgiveness of sins—and a lot among the saints by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, were the things that the Apostle was sent to accomplish. How did he effectuate this work? He tells us in the 22nd verse:—

“But being aided by the help of God, I stand unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, SAYING NO OTHER THING THAN THOSE WHICH THE PROPHETS AND MOSES DID SAY should come to pass.”

The Apostle thus informs us that the subject matter of his preaching was written in the Prophets and in Moses, and by that preaching he turned sinners “from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God”—the written word was brought home to their hearts in the power and demonstration of the Spirit—and they received forgiveness of their sins through the blood of Jesus, and an inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith in the same Lord. Therefore, the declaration of Mr. Tottenham, respecting the 3rd chap. of the 2nd Epistle to Timothy, still stands unaltered: though assailed, it hath not been moved; even that word—

“All Scripture, inspired of God, is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice.”

Herein is contained all that the child of God requires. He wants to be taught the knowledge of the one true God,

and Jesus Christ, whom he hath sent—he requires to be reproved for sin—to be corrected for iniquity—to be instructed in the ways of righteousness, that he may be perfectly furnished to every good work. So that the man who takes heed to the written law of God, and is taught by the Spirit, is furnished for every good work. If he can be perfectly furnished to every good work, by means of the written word, why should he go to the many traditions of man's invention, and not take the word of the living God—that word given for conversion, for sanctification, and for consolation to his own children, even to the very latest times. This is a solemn subject to us, that the Scripture contains the words of eternal life.

I perceive that I must soon cease to address you. I beseech you, as in the presence of the living God, that you will attend to the written word—

“All flesh is as grass, and all the glory thereof as the flower of the field. The grass is withered and the flower is fallen, because the Spirit of the Lord hath blown upon it. Indeed the people is grass. The grass is withered, and the flower is fallen; but the word of our Lord endureth for ever.”—You are “born again, not of corruptible seed, but incorruptible, *by the word of God*, who liveth and abideth for ever.”—Isaiah xl. 6—8—and 1 Pet. i. 23.

The written word “shall judge” all men at the last day. “The book shall be opened,” and then shall it be found whether men have lived in conformity with the declarations of that book, or whether they “have forsaken the waters—the living waters,” “and hewn out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water.”

I do not wish to proceed upon man's opinion on the subject of this Rule of Faith: I desire to stand firm and fast on the word of the living God; to take that sword of the Spirit to smite down error and to establish the truth. The mind will be tossed hither and thither by human opinion—it will be distracted by men's jarring and discordant ideas—and you will find the man of one century disagreeing with the man of another; but when we come to the word of God, and examine it from the first of Genesis to the last of Revelations, we will find a beautiful consistency there that the spirit of man can never produce—we will read all things necessary to make us “wise to salvation.”

As my time is short, I should like to advert to one circumstance to which allusion was made by the Rev. Gentleman yesterday. He said that, by our constant appeal to the written word, and by being allowed to use our own judgment thereon, the members of the Protestant Church must run into every species of fanaticism. And then I was



grieved to hear such mention of the name of a dear brother in the Lord, who, although he may have fallen into error, yet still he must be dear to the hearts of all who know him: he is dear to mine, as a Christian—as a devoted man—and I would to God that every man professing the name of Christian, loved the Lord Jesus Christ with the same sincerity, and was as devoted to the Lord as that man. I do not mean to attempt a defence of the errors into which he may have fallen, but in estimating a man's character, we ought not to imitate Satan and "winnow" him, for the purpose of finding the vile and refuse chaff, and neglecting the precious and good wheat.

This is an established principle in the Protestant Church, regarding fanaticism (I speak of the Church of England and orthodox Dissenters): when a man becomes a fanatic, he is cast out; for instance:—the Anabaptists were rejected in Germany, England, and Scotland, by the different reformers in those countries; but it is not so in the Church of Rome: up to the present day a man may be a fanatic or aught else he pleaseth, provided he believe in the infallibility of the Church.

*The Protestant Churches reject fanaticism as forming any part of their system; but the Church of Rome will hold and cherish fanatics in her bosom.* I will now refer, on this subject, to a book, a portion of which the Reverend Gentleman is obliged to read every day, under pain of mortal sin; it is THE BREVIARY. I read in this book of a certain St. Francis, *who sailed over an arm of the sea on his cloak, carrying with him several companions in his voyage.*—Breviar. 2 Aprilis, S. Francisci de Paula Confessoris, Lectio vi.

I take another specimen—St. Philip Neri; he was a singular man; *he could discern a Saint from his smell*—

"Virginitatem perpetuo illibatam servavit: idque assecutus est, ut eos qui puritatem colerent, ex odore, qui verò secus, ex fœtore dignosceret."—Brev. 26 Maii. Lectio vi.

Further, in order that he might bear the fulness of divine love, *the Lord, we are told, broke two of his ribs, to allow his heart to beat more freely.*

REV. T. J. BROWN Will you read that?

REV. JOHN LYONS—

"Caritate Dei vulneratus, languebat jugiter; tantoque cor ejus æstuabat ardore, ut cum intra fines suos contineri non posset, illius sinum, confractis atque elatis duabus costulis, mirabiliter Dominus ampliaverit."—Lect. V.

When Reverend Gentlemen speak of fanaticism, they

should remember that *it may be retorted upon them with ten-fold force.*

I now commend you to God and to the word of his grace, praying that the Spirit of the living God may descend on those who speak and on you who hear—that he may bless our hearts with a knowledge of his own dear Son—and that we, together with the whole Church, may meet in that kingdom where there is no strife—no division—no enmity—but where a sweet stream of love will flow through every bosom, and oneness of feeling will possess every heart—then we shall grow up to the perfect man—into the measure of the stature of the fulness of the Lord Jesus Christ.

---

THE REV. T. J. BROWN.

VERY different, Ladies and Gentlemen, is the situation of the Rev. Gentleman who addressed you just now and my situation. I indeed have a press of argument which I find necessary to contract, even to the depriving myself of the advantage I ought to derive from the development of it; he, on the other hand, appears to have remaining so little of argument, that it is necessary for him to enter upon a serious and solemn discourse respecting the general advantages of reading the word of God. Now to every one of these advantages I subscribe; but the conclusion to which he is bound to prove is yet far distant from his premises, viz., that the Bible *alone* contains ALL the doctrines which Christ willed that his Apostles should hand down to future ages. That is the point at issue, and I earnestly call your attention to it.

How can Mr. L. dare, in my presence, and in the presence of those who attended here during the past days of the discussion, to assert, upon the authority, as I understand him, of Mr. Tottenham, that *we had advanced* that tradition is placed above Scripture by the Church of Rome, notwithstanding the express and decisive declaration to the contrary which I gave in the exposition of our doctrine on the first day. How can any one, though repeatedly cautioned against uttering misrepresentation, venture to come forward and calumniate us in this manner.

No wonder that many of you have been heretofore impressed with false notions of the Roman Catholic religion, when it happens that, in our very presence, ministers of the Established Church dare to impute to us an assertion in express contradiction to the language we employed. Well did I to cite to you, on the first day, the authority of members, even Bishops of the Established Church, who owned that we had been maligned and cruelly calumniated; and this calumny is to be persevered in against us, regardless of honour, regardless of charity, regardless of the God of truth. I had told you that we *do not prefer tradition* to the word of God. I had told you that we contend that *all the primary essential doctrines* of Revelation are contained in the Holy Scriptures. I had told you that the decisions of Popes and Councils we do not put on an equality with the written word of God, for we hold the inspiration of every portion of the Sacred Scriptures, and establish it on a firm basis; but the decisions of Popes and Councils we do not pretend to be inspired, although we repose in the declarations of Christ, that he will be with his Church to preserve it from falling into error to the consummation of the world. There is then a wide difference between the belief imputed to us by the Rev. Gentleman who has just addressed you, and our creed.

But what answer has been given to the arguments which I recently urged? I had adduced many instances of doctrines which the gentlemen on the other side must take on the authority of tradition only. There was abundant scope for his ingenuity in reconciling such apparent inconsistency; instead of which, another attempt was made at imposing upon the audience, and I am represented to you as teaching that there is a contradiction between Scripture and tradition. I said not so; and I am tempted to employ terms in characterizing the proceeding of my opponent which I should afterwards regret to have uttered. Now I neither teach nor believe that between them there is any real contradiction; but pressing my opponents by what is termed an *argumentum ad hominem*, I exposed the fallacy of their “rule of faith” by showing that the ministers and members of the Established Church acknowledge, subscribe to, and believe in several doctrines for which there is *no clear proof in Scripture*, and to establish which they *must have recourse* to the authority of the Church, supported by the *traditions of past ages*.

I shall not dwell much at length upon such arguments as have been urged. There is but little to notice. I have, however, to remark that the texts produced from Scripture to prove the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, did not prove *clearly* the procession from both, but from the Father only. Now the great difficulty with the Greek Church is the *procession from the Son*. The Greek Church has as much learning and acquaintance with the Scriptures as the Rev. Gentleman, yet it is not able to discover the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son.

Referring to my arguments, Mr. L. told you that he had produced several commands for the Bible to be written. He did not, however, produce any texts expressing a command that the *whole of revelation* should be committed to writing, although this was the point which he ought to have established. What proof indeed was there of this in his bringing testimonies from Scripture that certain *portions* of revealed doctrines should be, or had been written? Is there any immediate connection between the fact that *portions* of revelation have been written, and that the *whole* of revelation has been committed to writing. My position therefore was, that there appears no divine command for *all the instructions* which Christ gave to his Apostles, ALL the communications relative to matters of belief designed to be handed down to future ages, for each one and all to be transmitted *no otherwise than by the written word*. This was my position; but the Rev. Gentleman takes credit for proving *things* which I never denied, and on which I freely agree with him.

What Mr. L. has advanced concerning the corruptions of the Catholic Scripture, I am obliged briefly to notice. Yesterday, by a quibble, he evaded the point upon which I challenged him, to show that, in the different editions of the Catholic Scriptures, there were any differences *on matters of belief*. I did not speak of literal or verbal variations merely, but of doctrinal variations; and I maintained that of these there was *not one* on any article of *belief* in the various editions of our own Scriptures. Moreover, whatever different readings of these Scriptures do occur in our Bibles have all originated in unimportant variations of ancient MSS.; and I shall just now have occasion, from the various readings of the Hebrew and Greek MSS. which we now have, and the variations in the modern Protestant translations of the Scriptures, to show the ad-

vantages of our Catholic translation ; for our Latin Vulgate was published in the fourth century by St. Jerome, on the authority of MSS. to which, at the present day, there are none equal, or approaching in antiquity.

Mr. L. attempted to prove the inspiration of the Epistles to Timothy from 1 Tim. c. 4, wherein it is foretold that some shall in latter times arise forbidding to eat meat and to marry. What proof, let me ask, is there here, that the Apostle was *inspired to write the whole* of these Epistles, because in the course of *one* of them, moved by the Holy Spirit, he *predicts* the future ? Does it thence follow that there was *a command to write* even this *one* Epistle ? Is there no difference between a prophet receiving a revelation from God with regard to certain points which he chooses to hand down in writing, and his receiving a divine command to *write* every portion of the book which contains that revelation. But Mr. L. brought forward the text in question because he thought he should be able to persuade you that the Catholic Church was condemned by it. The Apostle says there shall come some who shall forbid to marry and to eat meats. Now *we do not absolutely forbid to marry* ; that is another of the calumnies frequently uttered against us, and which I will cursorily notice. We do not prohibit marriage except when a person has voluntarily taken upon himself a *solemn obligation before God*, that he will abstain therefrom ; we contend merely, that when a person has made such a vow, he shall fulfil the vow he has taken to God. Does not St. Paul, 1 Tim. v. 11, 12, condemn the young widows who grew wanton, having broken their faith with God.

The Rev. Gentleman tells you that we are pointed out by the Apostle, because we forbid to eat meats. Does this come from a minister of the Established Church ? If I open his own Book of Common Prayer, I find therein a table of “ Days of abstinence and fasting,” and I find enjoined by it to fast and abstain during *the forty days of Lent*. Whilst we, in compliance with the injunctions of our Church, fast and abstain during those forty days, a minister of the Established Church, whose Book of Common Prayer equally enjoins the same observances, comes forward and applies to us a prediction of apostacy because we fulfil the injunctions of our Church, whilst he neglects the precepts of his. What sort of proceeding is this ?

Who then were those to whom the Apostle alluded ?

There were certain heretics in the early Church, such as the Manichees, the Encralites, &c., who did prohibit marriage and the eating of meats, because, as they taught, certain meats were *by their nature* impure, and matrimony was *always* a sin. We, on the contrary, contend that the state of marriage is *of itself* holy, and that all meats are *of themselves* clean.

But there was another assertion made which was still bolder. Yesterday Mr. T. told us that the inspiration of the Bible was *not an object* of faith, but the *means* only; and now his Rev. Friend, with whom I suppose he holds communion, gets up in the presence of us all, and not only subscribes to that doctrine, not only declares that the inspiration of the Bible is not an object of faith, but contends that there is *no other object of faith but the Lord Jesus Christ*. Was it in a moment of thoughtlessness that he uttered that expression; or was it the deliberate testimony of his unbelief? It was too shocking, I trust, to be his *deliberate* opinion. Yes! it has been declared in this assembly that not merely that the *chief*, but that *the only object of faith* of a minister of the Established Church is the Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore the *Trinity*, according to Mr. Lyons, is *not* an object of faith. Let then Mr. T. report Mr. L. to the Reformation Society; and let the Reformation Society exclude him from its platform, for not holding the essential doctrine of the Trinity as an object of his belief. For surely he ought to be excluded who does not hold that saving faith, which, according to that Society's teaching, is necessary in order that a Christian may be admitted to the presence of God.

Some stories were read to you about Catholic saints. I know not whether Mr. T. is disposed to support Mr. L. who, erroneously, translated the passage which he read from the Latin, that *many* of the companions of St. Francis sailed over the straits of Sicily on his cloak. I will not, however, lose my time upon these stories; they have *nothing to do with Catholic faith*. We are not called upon to *believe* the particulars related therein, and I do not place any certain reliance upon any one of those stories; I am as much permitted as you are to treat them as legendary tales. Mr. L. told you, that St. Francis *and many of his companions* swam over on his cloak; but, I repeat, the Latin does not bear that meaning; neither does it say, that "*Our Lord* broke the ribs of St. Philip Neri."

I now resume my reasoning against the Protestant Rule.

I had engaged to show, *first*, that the Protestant rule is not supported by proofs, evident or presumptive; *secondly*, that it is contrary to the express language of Scripture; *thirdly*, that it is contradicted in practice by Protestants; and, *fourthly*, that it involved many other insurmountable difficulties. The first three of those positions have not been fairly met. I now come to the fourth.

The remaining difficulties which encompass the Protestant rule arise from the obscurity of Scripture, and the insecurity of having for the *only* rule of faith, the *written* word of God, without a visible and unerring authority to expound its meaning. It has been repeated, that I am not to judge of the manner in which Christ willed his word to be handed down to our times. I do not, indeed, mean to say, that God *could not* have adopted this or that method of transmitting his revelations; but, I contend, that there is scriptural authority, as well as rational presumptions, against the fact, that Christ did will that, by *the written word only*, all the doctrines which he taught, should be conveyed to us. Now, I am entitled to the use of such reasoning as I have adopted, when, besides showing you how incompatible is the supposition of such an only rule with the conduct of the Apostles, and the practice of the primitive ages, I oppose to it, moreover, several manifest declarations of the inspired Volume, as well as the doctrines of Protestants on many points, which they cannot substantiate solely by the written word of God. Allow me, now, to lay before you some of the insurmountable difficulties of admitting Scripture as the only rule of faith, without an infallible expounding authority. The first is borrowed from the obscurity of the sacred text. I find in Scripture itself, evident proofs of this obscurity. In Luke xxiv. 13, is related the history of certain disciples who were going to a village called Emmaus. These disciples were as capable of understanding the sacred volume as the thousands into whose hands the work is now put, and yet they did not discover the very foundation of the doctrines of salvation therein; they did not discover belief in the resurrection of the Son of God. Accordingly, in the 27th verse, it is related, that Christ,

“Beginning at Moses and all the Prophets, expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself.”

In Acts viii. 30, 31, we read of an Eunuch, an officer of the Queen of Ethiopia, a man above the common rank, one who ought to have been able to understand the Scrip-



ture, if Scripture is so clear in all its essential parts ; this man has before him the book of the Prophet Isaiah, he is reading concerning a fundamental doctrine of salvation, the passion and death of the Messiah. Does he understand the book ? Does this man, having a mind above the ordinary calibre, comprehend what he reads therein ?—He does not : for it is related in c. viii. v. 30, 31—

“ Philip ran thither to him, and heard him read the Prophet Esaias, and he said, Understandest thou what thou readest ? And he said, *How can I, except some man should guide me ?* And he desired Philip that he should come up and sit with him.”

I refer you also to the 2d Ep. of St. Peter, iii. 16, where the Apostle says,

“ As also in all his (Paul's) Epistles, speaking in them of these things, in which there are some things *hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction.*”

Here is a solemn warning from the Apostle Peter, addressed to all who are ignorant and unstable, that, on account of the difficulty of understanding the written word of God, they are in imminent danger of wresting, not St. Paul's Epistles only, but likewise the other Scriptures, to their own destruction. I shall be taught, perhaps, that the declaration of the Apostle applies, not to the Epistles of St. Paul, but only to certain mysteries of which they treat.—Yes ; so I shall probably be answered ; and this answer furnishes an illustration of the impossibility, without the guidance of some unerring authority, for a man to be so sure that he understands rightly the written word on disputed matters, as to be able to make thereon an act of divine faith.

It is usual to refer to the Greek text in proof that the obscurity of which St. Peter speaks, and which he pronounces to be so dangerous to the unlearned and unstable, is to be explained of certain mysteries of which St. Paul had treated, because the Apostle uses the neuter pronoun *αὐς*, which, it is said, can be substituted only for the neuter noun, signifying *Mysteries*, and not for the feminine noun, which is translated *Epistles*. Now, as few of you will be able to avail yourselves of the Greek text, I will endeavour to assist you.

First, then, the Vulgate translation, made by St. Jerome, applies the Apostle's meaning to St. Paul's Epistles ; and this translation was taken from earlier Greek copies than any one now extant. Secondly, the feminine pronoun *αὐς*, referring naturally to the feminine noun, *epistles*,

is found in the celebrated Alexandrian MS., and in six other ancient MSS. Thirdly, Beza thought that reading more deserving of credit than the reading commonly adopted. Lastly, a celebrated Protestant Commentator upon Scripture, Dr. Macknight, examining the difficulty, observes that even if we do follow the ordinary Greek reading of the pronoun *οις*, yet the sense more naturally points to the Epistles of St. Paul, by understanding the noun *Γραμμασι*, signifying letters or writings. Is there not here sufficient to convince you that, not by the mere text of Scripture alone, without an expounding authority, can you be assured of the meaning of Scripture, which is not to be got at even by having recourse to the original Greek, the authorities on one side being answered by authorities on the other, which are deserving of equal credit.

This obscurity of Scripture is acknowledged even by Protestants, who own that they have not been able to discover that manifestation of divine light which is said to irradiate the minds and hearts of every one who reads the Scripture, and whereby all can understand its meaning. I have not time to dwell upon this topic; but, I hold in my hand (and, if I had not taken up so much time in refuting objections, I should have read a portion of it), Locke's Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul; and I invite any one who may happen to have the book in his possession, to peruse the preface, wherein he will find it acknowledged, that the Epistles of St. Paul were so obscure, that *even Locke* was not able to satisfy himself that he had ascertained their true interpretation. In acknowledgment of the obscurity of Scripture, I could quote the testimony of various other Protestants; but I shall content myself with one only, as my time is short. Arnaud de Pælembourg, in his preface to the works of Episcopius, says,

“ All controversies amongst Christians are enveloped in *profound darkness*, as well on account of the depth of the mysteries they regard, as of the *weakness* of our understandings; and *there is not one of the different parties, that does not follow some passage of Scripture* which, in his opinion, is probable.”

Facts, however, will appeal to your understanding more forcibly than the testimony of any single Protestant. A discussion, similar to the present, was held in the year 1566 at Waradin in Hungary, before Sigismund the First and the nobles of his court. The controversy was conducted between the New Arians on one side, having for their advocates George Blandrata and Francis David; on

the opposite side by the Lutherans and Calvinists, whose champions were Peter Milvius and P. Caroli.

Both parties were members of the new Reformation, but now arrayed against each other; both held one same rule of faith; both rejected tradition and authority; and both determined, if possible, to convict each other of heresy *by the same rule*. Day after day they disputed one against the other, and the result of each day's disputation left them as widely separated as they were before it. Texts from Scripture were brought forward on one side, and answered by the other; interpretations and solutions were reciprocally offered. At last Milvius and Caroli, the champions of the Lutherans and Calvinists, appealed *to the authority of tradition*, and quoted the belief of the Fathers. Then with just indignation the Arians rose up and said—"How dare you now to bring forward the authority of tradition in your disputes with Catholics. To be consistent with yourselves, either abandon the authority of men which you now oppose to the written word of God, or declare yourselves Papists." In like manner, to the gentlemen of the Reformation Society I say: "You hold many points which you are not able to substantiate except by tradition; either change therefore your Rule of Faith which excludes tradition, or act more consistently and become Roman Catholics." Thus the discussion broke up; the Lutherans and Calvinists withdrew in disgrace, whilst their antagonists were applauded by the King and all the assembly.

I shall be told, perhaps, that the obscurity of Scripture regards points upon which men may differ without disagreeing upon any matter of essential importance. Such probably is the answer that is already preparing for me. But the differences between Protestants prove that the obscurities of Scripture do not regard matters of little importance, but matters of *essential consequence*. Will you say that the doctrine of the real presence, as held by us, is not of *essential* importance? Are we not censured for it as being idolators? Has it not been assigned as one principal motive and ground of separation of many sects from the Church of Rome? You will however find, next week, that we shall produce from Scripture testimonies which appear to us most clear in favour of our doctrine, whereas our adversaries will not acknowledge these passages to be by any means favourable to us; they too on their side will appeal to other testimonies of Scripture,

of which we shall contest the meaning. Moreover, dissensions upon this matter have existed, not only between Catholics and Protestants, but amongst Protestants themselves. The Lutherans and the Sacramentarians engaged in violent altercations thereon, approaching almost to a bloody warfare. Hospinian, in his *Hist. Sacram.* part. 2, anno 1525, fol. 32, tells us that when Carlostadius, one of the leaders of the Sacramentarians, was sitting over his cups with Luther, the conversation turned upon the difference of belief on the real presence. Luther put into his hand a piece of money as an earnest of future controversy; and challenging him to the contest added, that the more virulent should be his invectives, the more he (Luther) would esteem him. Accordingly they did write against each other with scandalous acrimony; and I doubt not that the gentlemen of the Reformation Society, and all sensible Protestants feel ashamed of the way in which those Apostles of their Reformation conducted that controversy. It is evident, however, that Scripture is not clear even on essential doctrines.—Is not the Trinity of Persons in the unity of the Godhead another *essential* point? Yet upon the doctrine of the Trinity, which you seem to discover so clearly in Scripture, others find *therein* great obscurity. The Arians, a sect formerly more numerous than all the Protestants united, maintained that the consubstantiality of God the Son with his Father was not in Scripture; and they would not agree to the meaning of those testimonies of the written word by which we prove it. Texts such as you allege were produced; but they contended that they were obscure, and ought to be explained by contrary texts.—The Macedonians could not discover that the Holy Ghost was equal to the Father and the Son. Passages of Scripture were urged against them; they, on their side, brought forward other passages which they contended were as clear as those alleged against them.—The unity of Person in Christ is of great importance to faith, yet the Nestorians could not discover the clearness of Scripture on this head.—The Eutychians, on the contrary, a sect which remains to this day, could not discover in Scripture a difference of Natures in Christ, but they contended that his human nature was absorbed by the divine. Here then there are differences, not between Catholics and Protestants only, but between those who differ from you as well as us, *arising from the obscurity of Scripture in matters of the highest importance.*

Scripture is indeed so obscure, that I put it to yourselves whether any of you do make out the meaning of your only Rule of Faith by private judgment merely according to the principle of Protestants, or whether you do not depend upon the judgment and assistance of others. Do you collate passage with passage? Do you remove the obscurity of meaning in one place by the aid of others which are less obscure? Is it thus that you penetrate into the true sense of your only rule? Or do you not have recourse to your commentators? Do you not apply to your ministers, and rely entirely on their opinions and guidance? What else can account for Protestants remaining all their life in that sect in which they happened to be born? The mere fact of having been born in a particular sect does not make Scripture clear in this or that sense; yet you find generally that those who are born in the Established Church discover in Scripture the divine right of episcopacy; the Presbyterians, represented in the Reformation Society by Mr. Shanks, find in Scripture the Presbyterian doctrine, that Bishops are anti-scriptural, and that the Church should be governed only by elders. The Baptists find therein no authority for the baptism of infants; and the Quakers find no authority for baptism at all, and conclude that therefore baptism ought to be omitted. Whence comes it, I repeat, that you are all sure to find your particular creed, according to the particular church in which you were born? Is not this a proof that it is not upon the evidence of *Scripture alone* that you found your faith? There have been clear-headed Protestants who have acknowledged this. I will quote briefly from Sir Richard Steele's dedication to Pope Innocent XI. of his translation of a work entitled "An Account of the State of the Roman Catholic Religion throughout the World." In p. 2, he remarks with great acuteness that

With them (the Protestants) a claim is set up "to those privileges and perfections which you boast of as peculiar to your own. So that many of the most quick-sighted and sagacious persons have not been able to discover any other difference between us as to the main principle of all doctrine, government, worship, and discipline, but this one; viz. that you CANNOT ERR in any thing you determine, and *we never do*. That is, in other words, that you are infallible, and *we always in the right*."—p. 16. "For, at the same time that we are warmly contending against *your* disputants for the right of the people to search and consider the Gospel themselves, it is but taking care, in some other of our controversies, to fix it upon them, that they must not abuse this right; that they must not pretend to be wiser than their superiors; that they must take care to understand particular texts as the Church understands them; and

*as their guides, who have an interpretative authority to explain them. This we find to be as effectual with many as taking the Scriptures out of their hands; and because it is done in this gentlemanlike manner, and gives them an opportunity of showing their humility, it passes very smoothly off without their considering once the absurdity it leads to; that (as doctors differ, and councils too) this method layeth a necessity upon two different men, nay, upon the same man in different circumstances, to understand the same text in two different, and often in two contradictory senses."*

In a similar strain this eminent Protestant writer proceeds for several pages, clearly showing that you derive your faith not from the exercise of your own private judgment, but from the authoritative explanation of Scripture given you by your ministers. Once more, then, I put it to you, can Scripture be the *only* rule of faith? For that Christ instituted a rule we all acknowledge; but what must have been the character of that rule? We may certainly rely upon the wisdom and goodness of Christ, that as he willed man to be saved, he would not have abandoned each one to the exercise of his private judgment upon the meaning of such an obscure rule as this, of which he saw that so many various and conflicting interpretations would be given. Consequently Scripture, without an unerring authority to expound it, cannot, I maintain, be the only rule of faith, since I have shown, even by your own practice, that it is so very obscure. Although we may not oppose our reasoning to any revealed doctrine of Christ, yet I contend that we may argue from the known goodness and wisdom of God, that he would not act less wisely than a human legislator.

I come next to the *insecurity* of the Protestant rule. This is demonstrated from the uncertainty in which its different readings place you. You must borrow your meaning of Scripture, either from the original Hebrew text with regard to the Old Testament, and from the Greek with regard to the New; or from your own translation. Now, neither the Hebrew nor the Greek text are secure guides, neither is your own translation, because there have crept into all of them many corruptions. In the Hebrew text, the celebrated Dr. Kennicott has discovered between the edition of 1448 and that of Everardus Vanderhooght in 1705, 12,000 various readings. De Rossi, of Parma, has added thereto four quarto volumes. You will reply that these do not regard matters of much consequence. I have not now time to enter into this matter; but besides its various readings you are dependent for the correct meaning of the Hebrew upon the tradition

of men most averse to the Christian religion, the Jews. For, we must either read the Hebrew text *with* or *without* the vowel points. Now these vowel points are additions to the texts: vowels do not appear in the writings of several primitive languages, in which words were represented by consonants, and the sense must be made out only by the reader's supplying the vowels, so that widely different meanings may be given to the same word according to the vowels that are introduced. I may illustrate this by an example in English P N C H: this, according to the vowels you supply, either signifies something that is not very pleasant, *pinch*; or it may signify *punch*, which is more agreeable; or it may stand for *paunch*. If then you tell me that you read the Hebrew Scriptures *by* the vowel points, I ask from whom did you receive the vowel points? From the Jews, some hundreds of years after the introduction of the Christian religion, when Hebrew was a dead language. Then were invented those readings of the Sacred Text which were not probably the readings that the inspired writers designed, but the *unauthorized* traditional readings of the Jews. Or, you will tell me you read *without* the vowel points. From whom did you borrow your method? It is again from the suspicious traditions of the Jews, or from some fanciful system of your own.

The Greek text has been exceedingly mutilated. Dr. Mills enumerates 30,000 different readings in the different MSS. of the New Testament which he reviewed. I shall be told that these too do not affect the meaning upon matters of importance. I am prepared, however, to show they do affect the sense upon important points, and I will instance one or two. In John viii. 27, your reading is,

"They understood not that *he spake to them of the Father.*"

Our reading is,

"That he called God his Father."

Now your reading is founded on the Greek MSS., and so is ours. But there is an important difference in the meaning of these different readings; for ours proves the divinity of Christ which yours does not. In 1 John v. 6, you read,

"It is the Spirit that beareth witness, *because the Spirit is truth.*"



Beza, a celebrated Protestant scholar and divine, reads upon the authority of Greek MSS.

“The Spirit beareth witness *that* the Spirit is truth.”

The difference here, too is important; for upon his reading Beza in his notes of his Greek Testament grounds belief in the private testimony of the Spirit. In Acts i. 11, you will find these words:—

“This same Jesus which is taken up from you into Heaven, shall *so come* in like manner as ye have seen him go into Heaven.”

Such is your reading. Beza cites three MSS. which he read:—

“This same Jesus, *he himself* shall come, as ye have seen him go into Heaven.”

This also is an important variation, since Beza pretends, from the second reading, to draw an argument against the real presence. Here, then, we have a variety of readings which certainly tend to exhibit your rule of faith as *insecure*; and you have no visible unerring authority, on which you can rely to secure to you the meaning of your rule, the written word of God.

This would have been the place, but the argument was anticipated yesterday, in which I should refer you to the various and corrupt readings of modern Protestant translations. There is however another point which I shall briefly notice. Your meaning depends very much upon the different manner in which you punctuate the Scriptures. If the Scriptures were put into your hands without full-stops here or commas there, in fine, without any punctuation, or without being divided into chapters and verses, would you *then* be able to make Scripture the only rule of faith? Would *then* each one, by his private judgment, be able to satisfy himself upon the true reading of the Scriptures? It may not be known to all, though to many it probably is, that the Scriptures, as originally delivered, had no divisions or distinctions, such as they now have, of chapters, verses, and punctuation. These are all of modern introduction. Yet, the sense will depend greatly upon the manner in which the divisions and punctuation are placed. What authority have you for reading in various places with commas which suggest one interpretation, and not with full stops, which give another. In Rom. ix. 5. you read:

“Whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever.”

In this reading you find a manifest proof that Christ is God.

Your conclusion is reasonable from the punctuation, as it is in *your* printed copies : but there are others, Grotius and Socinus, who admit not that punctuation, and who cannot be proved by your principles not to have as much right as you to read the New Testament with such punctuation as *they* deem best. Now by placing a full stop, after the words :—" Christ came,"—the emphatic words " God blessed for ever," which form a separate sentence, are made not to apply to our divine Saviour, and thus you, who are without a visible unerring authority to expound the Scripture, are deprived of this text to prove the divinity of Christ. Direct this reasoning to many other important passages of Scripture which I have not time to adduce, and you will be convinced that there is in the Protestant rule, *by itself*, no means of satisfying yourselves that you have the true interpretation of the inspired books.

But we are secure. Whence, you ask, is our security? Our security is in the promises of God, that he will be with his Church *till the consummation of the world*; that his Spirit shall *lead it unto all truth*; that, according to the declaration of St. Paul, the Church is the *pillar and ground of the faith*. Satisfied therewith, we receive the true interpretation of Scripture, *on contested matters*, from the unerring Church; and, in so receiving it, we are CERTAIN, that we are not going astray from the real meaning of the inspired word of God.

---

THE REV. E. TOTTENHAM.

MR. BROWN started in his last speech by expressing his supposition that it was in consequence of the lack of argument on this side, that my reverend friend (Mr. Lyons), who has left the room, preached to the people on the value of the Scriptures. Now, it was not on account of any want of argument that my friend thus preached, but he doubtless recollected that he was a *minister* as well as a *disputer*, and that, though his primary object in coming here was to advance and to answer certain arguments, yet that the Apostle's exhortation holds good even in this place—to " preach in season and out of season." My opponent,

in his first speech to-day, adverted again to the text in Timothy, which has been brought forward several times during this discussion, and to an observation of mine with respect to it,—namely, that Christ did not come to introduce a new religion, but to give a fuller revelation of the same religion which had, in its fundamental principles, existed previously in the world. He said, “if this be a fact, how can you prove the Trinity, and how can you establish baptism from the Old Testament?” Now, Sir, *even supposing* that I, individually, were placed in a difficulty on this point, and were consequently unable to prove either the one or the other from the Old Testament, I might, nevertheless, stand upon the Apostle’s words, which say, that the Old Testament Scriptures, of which he speaks, were “*able to make a man wise unto salvation.*” It matters not then *what doctrines* Mr. Brown asks me to prove out of the Old Testament. *The Apostle’s words* are sufficiently declarative of the fact that the Old Testament Scriptures must contain *all truth absolutely necessary to salvation.*

But my friend, who has left the room, has shewn you that the doctrine of the Trinity *can* be derived from the Old Testament, and he has referred you also to the practice of the Jews even at this day, who acknowledge the Trinity in their Synagogues. As to *baptism* not being proved out of the Old Testament, Mr. Brown should recollect that the corresponding rite of *circumcision* can be abundantly proved, if baptism cannot: and the reason why baptism cannot be proved from the Old Testament is obvious: it was introduced in the New Dispensation to occupy the place of circumcision in the Old.

Mr. Brown has re-asserted, what he declares, he has often said, that all primary essential truth is contained in the written Word, *but not all that Christ said.* I am a little surprised at Mr. Brown’s urging this statement again, because I admitted fully, from the outset, that we had no reason to suppose that *all the things which Christ said* are contained in Scripture. I contended that *all necessary truth* being contained in Scripture is enough to constitute it a *sufficient rule of faith.* As to *all that Christ said* not being contained in Scripture, that is nothing to the point. St. John says, as I quoted yesterday, in his 21st chap. and 25th verse:—

“But there are also many other things which Jesus did: which, if they were written every one, the world itself, I think, would not be able to contain the books that should be written.”

Here the Apostle, by a strong figure, declares the impossibility of every thing which Christ said or did, being *written*—and if such be the impossibility on the score of *writing* them—if “all the world could not contain the books that should be written,”—is it really a fact, as I asked before, that the Church of Rome has got these sayings and doings *in her traditions*?

With regard to the difficulty that was started about knowing which councils were general or legal, Mr. Brown passes this over very summarily. He declares he will not enter into the subject, because no Roman Catholic feels a difficulty upon the point. Why, Sir, that may be very true, certainly. There may be many Roman Catholics who do not *feel* a difficulty on this point, but I contend they are *in* a difficulty, and a most dangerous one too: and it behoves them to consider it well, lest they may be resting their faith upon a human foundation.

In reference to the eight Eastern Councils of which I spoke, my opponent said there was no instance of any council being held where a Pope or his Legate did not preside. I think, however (to go no further into the subject), that Mr. Brown will find it very difficult to prove that, at least in the first Nicene Council, *either Pope or Legate presided*. A body of evidence can be adduced to prove that it was the Emperor Constantine who presided; or, if any ecclesiastic did preside, it was Hosius, a Spanish Bishop. The onus now rests on Mr. Brown *to prove* that the Pope or his Legate presided: as for the Pope himself, the fact is admitted that he did not, on account of the infirmities of old age.

Allusion has been made to a variety of subjects which Protestants believe and practise, but which, we are told, cannot be proved from Scripture. We are informed that Protestants, at least members of the Church of England, believe in infant baptism; and that Protestants generally, believe in the change of the Sabbath: that they eat blood, and that they do not wash their neighbours' feet; and Mr. Brown contends that, because such is their belief and practice, while they cannot, *according to his judgment*, substantiate them from the Scriptures, *therefore the Scriptures are insufficient as a rule of faith*! Now, Sir, I think this is as complete a *non sequitur* as ever I heard in my life. How does the argument really stand for infant baptism, for the change of the Sabbath, and all the other points that Mr.

Brown maintains are not sanctioned by Scripture? *If they were not to be found in Scripture the conclusion would be, not that the Scriptures were insufficient as a rule of faith; but either that we were wrong in holding those things, (if they were directly opposed to Scripture), or, only, that they were matters of minor consequence, (if they were not supported by Scripture, but yet not contrary to its testimony.)* That would be the legitimate conclusion. But I am not going just now to enter into proofs, in continuation of what my friend said relative to these different subjects, particularly as this is my last speech, and I have something else to do.

Let me here notice an inconsistency with regard to Mr. Brown's reasoning, which has followed him during the whole course of the discussion. He says, that *tradition is the divine authority* on which we receive the Bible as *inspired*. Now, mark that; and yet, what did Mr. Brown attempt yesterday? Why, he endeavoured to prove *the divine authority of tradition from the Bible!* He asserts that we must know the inspiration of *the Bible from tradition*, and yet he endeavours to prove *tradition from the Bible*; and if this be not *arguing in a circle*, I do not know what is.

As respects the subject of baptism, although I am not about to enter at length into the proofs concerning it, yet I am going to refer to a kindred point, which is, perhaps, of as much consequence at the present moment. Mr. Brown says, infant baptism cannot be proved from Scripture. Now, *suppose it cannot*, that, as I before argued, *would not prove the Bible to be an insufficient rule of faith*, but would prove, at the most, that certain classes of Protestants are mistaken in holding infant baptism. I open, however, the Catechism of the Council of Trent, and I read thus:—

“That this law (i. e. of Baptism) extends, not only to adults, but also to infants, and that the Church has received this its interpretation from Apostolic tradition, is confirmed by the authority and strengthened by the concurrent testimonies of the Fathers.”

Thus far for the introduction. Then the Catechism proceeds:—

“Besides, it is not to be supposed that Christ our Lord, would have withheld the sacrament of baptism, and the grace which it imparts, from children, of whom he said, “*Suffer the little children, and stay them not from coming unto me; for the kingdom of Heaven is for such*”—from children whom he embraced—upon whom he imposed hands—whom he blessed. Moreover, when we read that *an entire family* was baptized by St. Paul, *children, who are included in their number*, must, it is obvious, have also been cleansed in the purifying waters of baptism. Circumcision too, which was a figure of baptism, affords a strong

*argument* in proof of this primitive practice. That children were circumcised on the eighth day is universally known. If then circumcision, "made by hand, in despoiling of the body of the flesh," was profitable to children, shall not baptism, which is the circumcision of Christ, not "made by hand," be also profitable to them?" &c. &c.—Cat. Concil. Trid. Pars 2. de Bap. Sac.

Now, Sir, I say that though the Church of Rome professes to have tradition in favour of infant baptism; yet here the Catechism of the Council of Trent, published by order of Pope Pius V., *proves infant baptism by the very same Scriptural references* by which Protestants of the Church of England prove it at the present day. And yet Mr. Brown says infant baptism *cannot* be proved from Scripture.

I shall give you also the testimony of Cardinal Bellarmine (and he was a man of some weight, it will be acknowledged, in the Church of Rome) on his subject:—

"Although we do not find it expressly commanded that we should baptize infants, yet this is gathered with sufficient clearness from the Scriptures, as we have already shown."

Then he goes on to observe:—

"Besides, the tradition of the Apostles is of not less authority with us than Scripture."—Bell. de Sac. Bap. lib. i. c. 9. sect. 2.

You see here that, independant of the testimony of tradition, Bellarmine asserts that, though there is no actual command respecting infant baptism, *yet it may be gathered from Scripture with sufficient clearness*. So far for the testimony of a Roman Catholic Cardinal, and of the Roman Catholic authorised Catechism, on this subject.

But Mr. Brown attempted to evade one of the arguments which we might use on the subject of infant baptism by saying, "You will bring me to the place where it is said St. Paul baptized the house of Stephanas: and you will say there were children in the household: but that is a mere matter of opinion." *It happens, nevertheless, that this is the precise argument which the Catechism of Trent has used:—*

"Moreover, when we read that *an entire family* was baptized by St. Paul, children, who are included in their number, must, it is obvious, have also been cleansed in the purifying waters of Baptism."—Cat. Concil. Trid. Pars 2. de Bap. Sac.

There the TRIDENTINE CATECHISM does teach there were children baptized in the case referred to, although MR. BROWN is not contented with the argument, inasmuch as he supposes it is a mere matter of opinion.

The Rev. Gentleman further talked of baptism by sprinkling and by immersion, and he contends that the literal meaning of the original word, is, that persons

should be baptised *by immersion*, not by sprinkling. Then he refers to the case of the Church of England baptizing by sprinkling. It is unnecessary for me to enter into a criticism on the Greek word, but I beg Mr. Brown to notice the public and private baptism of infants in the Book of Common Prayer, and likewise the case of adult baptism, and he will find that the Church of England holds *primarily* baptism *by immersion*; and it is a *departure from the regular rule* when baptism *by sprinkling* is used. I shall give an extract from the service for the Public Baptism of Infants. After the Minister tells the Sponsors to name the child, the Rubric says:—

“ And then, naming it after them, (if they shall certify him that the child may well endure it) *he shall dip it in the water* discreetly and warily, saying, &c.—but if they shall certify that the child is *weak*, it shall suffice to *pour water* upon it, saying, &c.”

Next, at the close of the form of Private Baptism, and of the reception of such, as were privately baptized, into the Church, we read:—

“ But if they which bring the infant to the church do make such uncertain answers to the priest’s questions, as that it cannot appear that the child was baptized with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, (which are the essential parts of Baptism) then let the priest baptize it in the form before appointed for public baptism of infants; saving that *at the dipping of the child in the font*, he shall use this form of words, &c.”

I go now to the Baptism of those of Riper Years; and this is the declaration:—

“ Then shall the Priest take each person to be baptized by the right hand and placing him conveniently by the font, according to his discretion, shall ask the godfathers and godmothers the name; and then **SHALL DIP HIM IN THE WATER**, or *pour water on him*, saying, &c.”

In these three instances the *primary law*, you perceive, is baptism *by immersion*: and then there is a departure from it allowed, in certain cases, according to the Rubric.

Mr. Brown seemed to be very much offended at a declaration made by Mr. Lyons, namely, that Roman Catholics placed tradition above the Scriptures; and he adds, that Mr. Lyons made this assertion in corroboration of what I had previously said. Now, what my Rev. friend shewed was, that (*according to Mr. Brown’s reasoning* in those several cases that he adduced) tradition and Scripture *would contradict each other*: and, therefore, if Roman Catholics hold their sentiments upon those several points *from tradition*, they must have *practically* made tradition superior to the written word. As to myself, I yesterday quoted a passage from Bellarmine, in



which he declares that though all necessary truths are contained in Scripture, yet “the true sense of the Scriptures *depends upon the unwritten tradition of the Church:*” and what I said was, that it is *practically* putting the unwritten word *above* the written, if the sense of the latter *depends* upon the interpretation of the former.

Respecting the procession of the Holy Ghost, you will remember that my Rev. opponent, in his *first* observations on that subject, stated that the procession of the Holy Ghost *from the Father and the Son* could not be proved from Scripture: but in his *last* speech he has *admitted* that the text quoted by Mr. Lyons proves the procession *from the Father*, but *not from the Son*. Even with regard to this latter point, however, he has taken quite a different view from the Rhemish Annotators, for in the note on the passage in the Rhemish Testament, we read thus:—

“THIS PROVES, against the modern Greeks, (to whom Mr. Brown referred) that the Holy Ghost proceedeth *from the Son*, as well as from the Father: *otherwise he could not be sent by the Son.*”

If Mr. Brown is content to be at issue with the Rhemish Annotators, in order to maintain his point, he certainly may.

Allusion was next made to some observations of Mr. Lyons' yesterday *as to the variations in the Douay Bible*. In order to correct a false impression that appears to have rested on the minds of our friends on the other side, I must re-assert, what I believe I stated in my last speech yesterday, namely, that the object of Mr. Lyons *at that time*, was not, primarily, to shew the corruptions existing in that version, but to point out *that successive editions of the Douay Bible had approximated nearer and nearer to the authorized version of the Scriptures*; and this was done for the purpose of vindicating the latter, which we supposed to have been attacked by Mr. Macdonnell, no title having been given to the Bible upon which observations had been made by him.

The proof of the inspiration of one of the Epistles to Timothy which my friend adduced, did not appear to satisfy Mr. Brown; *and at this dissatisfaction I confess I am not at all surprized*. He declares, however, that the Church of Rome *does not forbid marriage!* This statement requires no comment. I shall simply let Mr. Brown's declaration go forth to the world, to be viewed in

connexion *with the practice* of the Church of Rome ; and let the people judge upon the subject for themselves.

But, with regard to abstaining from meats, and fasting, the Rev. Gentleman, instead of meeting the argument that was derived from the text in Timothy, has fallen into the error, of which I was accused on a preceding day, as if it were a heinous sin, I mean *retort*. Mr. Macdonnell brought a charge against me, that, instead of defending my own Rule of Faith, I was retorting upon theirs. Now, in the case before us, Mr. Brown was reminded of a certain point chargeable against his Church, and instead of defending the point, *he retorts upon the Established Church*, and he says, that *our Prayer-book inculcates fasting*, as well as the Church of Rome. Were I to act upon Mr. Macdonnell's principle, I should not feel called upon to notice this retort ; but I shall do so in order to show, that, *in the present case, it does not hold good*. I allow at once, that the Church of England does not consider fasting to be wrong : nay, she admits it to be *scriptural*. Why, then, does she differ from the Church of Rome ?—*not* because the Church of Rome *inculcates fasting* ; but because she makes it a matter of *constraint, and perverts it to unscriptural purposes*. I have a number of Roman Catholic Catechisms in my hand, and I shall read a few extracts in reference to this point. In the “Abridgement of Christian Doctrines,” revised by the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle, chap. 9, we have this question and answer :—

“ Q. For what is fasting available ?

A. First, *for the remission of sins*, and appeasing the wrath of God, according to that, ‘ Be ye converted unto me in your whole heart, in fasting, and weeping, and mourning.’ ”

The next is a Catechism by the Most Rev. Dr. J. Butler, “ revised, enlarged, approved, and recommended by the four (Irish) Roman Catholic Archbishops, as a general Catechism for the Kingdom.”—In the 20th Lesson I read thus :—

“ Q. Why does the Church command us to fast and to abstain ?

A. To mortify our sinful passions and appetites, and to *satisfy for our sins, by doing penance for them*. ”

I have also, “ An Abstract of the Douay Catechism ”—

The Rev. T. J. BROWN.—That is not to the point.

The CHAIRMAN.—It appears to me, that he is answering the argument.

The Rev. E. TOTTENHAM resumed.—*I am shewing only that Mr. Brown's retort upon the Church of England, does not hold good*. I am pointing out the *purpose* of fasting

in the Church of Rome, as distinguished from that in the Church of England: however, the extracts I have given, are sufficient for my purpose, without any others in addition. It is on account of *the purpose*, and *not* on account of *the practice*, that we object to the Church of Rome, and hence Mr. Brown's retort goes for nothing.

It has been stated, that Mr. Lyons went even farther than I did, and made assertions still bolder. He declared, that, in strictness, we have no other object of faith but **THE LORD JESUS CHRIST**. Upon this Mr. Brown makes an appeal similar to what he made yesterday, and hopes, as he then did, that, for the honour of religion, Mr. Lyons had committed himself, and that it was in the thoughtlessness of the moment he made the assertion. Now, how did Mr. Brown meet my friend's statement? "If Christ," says he, "be the only object of faith, then the *Trinity* is not an object of faith." This, I think, is one of the most extraordinary arguments that has yet been adduced, because the Rev. Gentleman ought to know *what is involved in having Christ as an object of faith*. A BELIEF IN A TRINITY OF PERSONS IN THE UNITY OF THE GODHEAD IS ESSENTIALLY INVOLVED IN HAVING CHRIST AS THE PROPER OBJECT OF FAITH: for Christ cannot be properly the object of faith except we believe in his SUPREME AND PROPER DEITY.—That is the foundation-stone on which the whole economy of salvation rests: and, therefore, the argument of our antagonist is a ridiculous one indeed on this subject.

My friend, Mr. Lyons, referred to a very troublesome book, **THE BREVIARY**; and Mr. Brown says, he does not wish to enter into the stories there recorded, a few of which Mr. Lyons gave. Why does he not like to enter into them? because, he says, *they have nothing to do with the subject*. Nevertheless, how really stands the case? Mr. Brown argued against the Protestant Rule of Faith, *that it led to fanaticism*, and he instanced a case which he supposed to be in point. Mr. Lyons then shewed, that, under the Roman Catholic Rule, there was *as much fanaticism*, **NAY MORE**, than under the Protestant; and, therefore, by this process, he answered the original argument of our opponent, by shewing that it *proved too much*. But the Breviary, I find, has been *thrown overboard altogether* by the statements on the other side; and, I do not know how our friends can reconcile such conduct with the requirements of the **COUNCIL of TRENT**, *which has sanctioned the Breviary as well as the Missal*.

The obscurity of Scripture has been again dwelt

on, and we have been referred to the close of the Gospel of St. Luke, where the account of the journey of the two disciples to Emmaus is given, and of the manner in which Christ joined them and entered into conversation with them. We are told that these two disciples did not discover the truth of Christ's mission and resurrection in the Scriptures, and, therefore, the Scriptures could not have been a sufficient Rule of Faith to them. I think our friends on the other side might have found an answer to this objection in my comment upon this passage in my opening speech. For *how did Christ prove the things concerning himself?* from nothing else but **THE WRITTEN WORD OF GOD**. In chap. xxiv. 25—27, we read—

“Then he said to them:—O foolish and slow of heart to believe in all things which the Prophets have spoken. Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and so to enter into his glory? And *beginning at Moses and all the Prophets*, he expounded to them **IN ALL THE SCRIPTURES** the things that were concerning him.”

Then he says, in the 44th verse—

“These are the words which I spoke to you while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in *the law of Moses*, and in *the Psalms*, and in *the Prophets*, concerning me.”

No other rule was here recognised by Christ, but the three great divisions of the Jewish Scriptures, the **LAW**, the **PROPHETS**, and the **PSALMS**.

Reference has also been made to the 2d Epistle of Peter, 3d chap. 15th and 16th verses; and, in truth, I was a little astonished that this passage, being so great a favourite, had not been quoted before. I intended to have anticipated it, as this is my last address, but I am glad it has been brought forward by the other side. It is as follows:—

“Account the long-suffering of our Lord salvation, as also our most dear brother Paul, according to the wisdom given him, hath written to you; as also in all his Epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are certain things, hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, to their own destruction.”

This, we are informed, proves, that some things in Scripture are “hard to be understood:” and hence an argument is deduced against the Scriptures as the only Rule of Faith. Mr. Brown anticipated an objection which might be raised as to the things of which the Apostle speaks, namely, *that they referred to certain truths contained in St. Paul's Epistles, and not to the Epistles themselves*; and he spent some time in endeavouring to meet the objection. Now I shall give him the benefit of all his statements on this point; because, although I might adduce

criticism to refute the force of his interpretation, I think the matter can be settled satisfactorily without such critical dissertation—for the passage asserts what I did not deny. *I set out with admitting the fact.* I said it was to be expected that there would be some difficulties and obscurities in the Scriptures, just as there are in Creation and in Providence ; but I adverted to texts in the written word of God, to shew, that, *in all things pertaining to salvation, the Scriptures were sufficiently plain.* I adverted to a text in Peter, as the best expositor of Peter ; and what did we find him saying, in the 19th verse of the first chapter of his second Epistle ?—

“ We have,” says he, “ the more firm prophetic word : whereunto ye do well to attend, *as to a light that shineth in a dark place.*”

So that here Peter says, even of Prophecy, (confessedly the most difficult part of Scripture) that it is “ *a light that shineth in a dark place.*” I admit that there are obscurities and difficulties, but the expression “ *certain things,*” does not imply (but the contrary) that *all* things in the Epistles of Paul are hard to be understood. And, then, mark, Peter *gives no prohibition* against the reading of Scripture, or the appealing to it as the Rule of Faith, *because* there are “ things hard to be understood.” Here was an opportunity for bringing in the unwritten word, or the Infallibility of the Church. But there is not a word about such matters. He merely cautions them against wresting the difficult portions of Scripture, and every Christian Minister would do the same ; but so far from not sanctioning the duty of reading and appealing to the Scriptures, he proceeds rather, by the terms used, *to encourage their perusal.* Besides, I may ask, if the people to whom the Apostle alludes, did pervert the Scriptures, how comes it to pass (on Roman Catholic principles), that they were *allowed to retain them* without a prohibition ? At all events, *they must have had them, before they could have perverted them.*

The Rev. Gentleman has drawn our attention to the 8th chapter of Acts, where we read, that the Eunuch required Philip to instruct him. Almost all Mr. Brown's arguments, in the course of his last speech, *went on the supposition that we were opposed to instruction.* Now, on the contrary, we contend for the importance of instruction, as the very existence of a body of ministers in the Church proves. We look upon teachers as valuable for the purpose of guiding the people *to*, and of commenting *on*, the Rule

of Faith ; but we call upon those who are taught not to receive any thing but what can be proved to be true *by* the Rule of Faith.

Statements were also made relative to the supposed insecurity of the Protestant Rule of Faith, arising from the *various readings* in the original languages. Now, let me say, in reply (though Mr. Brown has anticipated somewhat of the answer), that the various readings *do not affect the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith*. I do not say that there are not any which occur with respect to passages that *have a reference to doctrines*. This may be the case, but what I contend for, is, that, from all the number of which Mr. B. spoke, no various readings can be produced affecting doctrines, without those doctrines being most clearly and powerfully established by *other texts* of Scripture, *respecting which there is no doubt on the ground of various readings*. There is, therefore, no difficulty or insecurity arising from this point. But, then, the Infallible Church of Rome has, I suppose, been quite *free* from various readings! Take an example. Pope Sixtus the 5th issued an edition of the Vulgate, in which he pronounced an anathema against any one that should alter it “*in minimâ particulâ* :” but, Pope Clement the 8th issued, shortly afterwards, another edition, in which, as my friend Mr. Lyons told you, *he altered two thousand passages* in Sixtus the 5th’s Bible! I have here a regular account of all the variations by Dr. James, in his work entitled, *Bel-lum Papale*.

We were told, that we had to depend upon the Jews for the text of the Hebrew Scriptures. Now, if we may trust the testimony of a credible historian, we may very well depend on the Jews (though they were not favourable to Christianity), so far as regards the Old Testament Scriptures. We have the testimony of Philo Judæus as to the extraordinary care they took of those writings :—

“ They would not,” he says, “ change a *single letter* in them ; but would rather die a thousand deaths than that any thing should be altered in those laws and statutes.”—*Phil. apud Euseb. de præpar. Evangel. lib. 8.*

So that we see the Jews were exceedingly careful on these points.

My time is passing on ; and there is another objection which has not yet been started, but which I wish to notice, lest it should be started in the next speech ; though I do not think it fair that *new matter* should be then introduced. The objection is this :—that even if it were to be admitted,



that the Scriptures were once sufficient, yet there have been several books *lost*, which are specified in both the Old and New Testaments, and this loss proves the insufficiency of the remainder. I beg, at the outset, to *dispute* (for many reasons into which I do not feel called on now to enter) *the loss of any books of Scripture*. But, suppose any *were* lost, that would not prove that what we have now, is insufficient as a Rule of Faith ; for, the 20th chap. of John (to which I have so frequently referred) proves, that all absolutely essential and necessary truth is contained in that one Gospel, supposing there were none other in existence, and, therefore, *a fortiori*, in *all* the books we have at present. Moreover, if any books have been lost, how has this come to pass ? What a tolerable specimen of guardianship has the Church of Rome, that claims to be the depository of the Sacred Volume, manifested in *having suffered them to be lost* ! I think that members of the Church of Rome should put upon their Ministers the task of accounting for the unfaithfulness of the Church in not preserving them. But, I would remind you, also, that it does not follow, because certain books have been *referred to in Scripture*, that they have been *inspired* books. The onus rests on the other side to *prove* that they were inspired. If the principle be adopted, that, because certain books are *referred to* in Scripture, they must needs be inspired ; then, upon the same principle, I might prove *that certain heathen poets were inspired* ; for, in the 17th chapter of the Acts, and elsewhere, the Apostle Paul *quotes* from heathen poets.

As this objection has not been formally started, these observations will suffice to show, that there is no argument in it against the Protestant Rule of Faith.

Now, Sir, I have arrived at my last speech in the discussion of the first subject ; and, in concluding, I would beg our friends not to take a confined view of any isolated arguments, but to look at both sides of the question, and to take a general view of the whole. I started with laying down a principle, which, I contend, is *not met* : in fact, *confessedly, the texts to which I referred, with the exception of two or three, have not been noticed* : but, it has been said, over and over again,—“ *they shall be left for the public to read in the printed report* ! ” I set out with proving from texts of Scripture, that the written word *contained all necessary truth* to be believed. Then I established, by a long series of passages, that there was *no*



*other rule used in the Jewish Church*, but the written word. I quoted also a number of passages relative to *the conduct of our Lord and his Apostles*, all proving, invariably, that the written word was the *only standard of appeal*, they having never referred, in a single instance, to any other standard. One or two supposed cases of the contrary Mr. Macdonnell attempted to deduce from the 9th and 10th chapters of Acts. In one of those cases it has been shewn, that it was not for the purpose of being instructed in the faith, that Paul went to Ananias, but that he might “receive his sight,” be “filled with the Holy Ghost,” and be “baptized.” The second, (namely, that respecting Cornelius) proves nothing, because, even if the facts of the case were correctly stated on the other side, the passage would only establish that, *during the life time of the Apostles*, their oral teaching did constitute a part of the Rule of Faith, *which we admitted*; but contended also that that oral teaching was *by them committed to writing*, to be, with the Old Testament, the Rule of Faith for future ages.

On the other side, you will recollect, that various and numerous were the objections started. It was stated that the Bible could not be the sole rule of faith because Christ did not *command it to be written*: but it was said in reply that, independant of any actual command which was adduced, the Holy Ghost *inspired* them, and that was equivalent to a command. It was urged that the Apostles *preached* in the first instance, and that Christ commanded them to instruct by preaching, but not by writing. We answered that they did preach in the first instance without writing, because they were infallible authorities *themselves*, proving the truth of what they taught *by miracle*; but we established also that they *committed to writing the truths they preached*, and the remarkable testimony of IRENÆUS was adduced upon this subject, *giving precisely the same explanation that we gave*. There were objections, moreover, with regard to various readings and translations, &c., which, you remember, we answered in different ways. Arguments were also urged on the ground of the alleged obscurity of Scripture, and its liability to conflicting interpretations. Amongst other replies to these, we pointed out how the Roman Catholic Rule was open to a similar objection. I showed instances of Roman Catholic Doctors mistaking the doctrines of their church. I gave one instance of Soto and Vega *misinterpreting the decrees of the Council of Trent*

on Grace and Justification. I shewed you also that Bel-  
larmino and Catharinus differed on the subject of Inten-  
tion, as propounded by the same Council. Other argu-  
ments were advanced which I have not time to reca-  
pitulate. You will see they *affect not the main question,*  
*but are mere captious objections.* I have shewn that the  
Scriptures *testify of their own sufficiency,* and that the  
written word was ever the standard of appeal *in the Jewish*  
*Church,* and was also recognized and enforced as such *by*  
*the practice of our Lord and his Apostles.* Now, until you  
meet with far more solid arguments than have yet been  
advanced, I recommend every one present to have recourse  
to THE SCRIPTURES, which, according to the statement of  
the Apostle,—“*can instruct unto salvation by the faith*  
*which is in Christ Jesus.*”—If you want peace, pardon,  
and instruction, go in a humble and teachable spirit, to  
that word of which David says—“*Thy word is a lamp unto*  
*my feet, and a light unto my paths.*”

---

THE REV. T. J. BROWN.

THE Rev. Gentleman need not apprehend that I shall  
act in any dishonourable manner towards him, in my clos-  
ing speech. I hastened rapidly through many arguments  
which I wished to have displayed more at length, because  
I was desirous of not having to enter now upon new topics,  
to which I reflected that he would not have an opportunity  
of replying, and from some on that account, I abstain alto-  
gether. His objections, however, I must briefly notice.  
Some of those which I shall refer to were urged on former  
days; the others were brought forward during the last  
speech.

With respect to the eight Eastern Councils, Mr. T. main-  
tains that they were assembled by the Emperors. I might  
admit that, in the sense I explained on a former day; but  
this I contend for, and he will not be able to shew the con-  
trary, that they were all presided over by legates or depu-  
ties from the Holy See.—He calls my attention to the first  
Nicene Council. I accept the challenge on that point.  
The President of that Council was Osius, the Bishop of  
Cordova, who had *no title* to preside, *except as a legate of*

*the holy see* ; for nothing else than that would have qualified him, a bishop of an inferior see, to hold precedence of those Bishops who represented the patriarchal churches. That Constantine did not preside is a matter which appears to me quite clear as any thing in history.

Mr. Tottenham seeks to refute my objection against the Protestant rule that it is in contradiction with the practice of Protestants on the administration of baptism to infants, by alleging the authority of the catechism of the Council of Trent, which cites the testimony of Scripture in favour of infant baptism. This is one more of the many artifices which I have had to expose. That the authority of Scripture may be brought forward to confirm the validity of infant baptism I do not deny ; but what I asserted was that those proofs *alone* are not sufficient, either to convince the Baptists, or to establish the validity of such baptism. It is true, therefore, that the catechism of the Council of Trent, does quote Scripture in favour of infant baptism ; it does not, however, rely upon the authority of Scripture as *alone* conclusive, but as confirmatory only of tradition. Hence the catechism of the Council of Trent is not at variance with itself, nor with the reasoning which I employed.

Mr. T. labours to remove another difficulty regarding baptism by *aspersion*, by telling me that Protestants hold immersion to be the *ordinary* means of conferring baptism. This is not the point in dispute. I contended, and I still contend that those Protestants are inconsistent with their only rule of faith, who approve of baptism as valid, under any circumstance whatsoever, which is not according to the Scriptural mode of conferring it. I afterwards showed, first, that most Protestants do hold as a matter of faith, that baptism by sprinkling, or the pouring on of water is *valid* : and, secondly, I argued that therein they proclaimed the insecurity of the very fundamental principle of their Religion, by admitting as valid a mode of baptism, which Scripture does not authenticate.

The differences in the edition of the Bible of Sixtus Quintus and Clement VIII. have been again brought forward. It was not for fear of meeting that, or any other objection, that I have passed by several which were urged, but I did so because the force of the arguments which I had in store would have lost much of their weight, if too far separated. I now reply, first, that these variations, in the editions of the Scriptures by Sixtus and Clement, *do not affect any matter of faith or doctrine* : secondly, that

Sixtus Quintus prohibits all *unauthorized persons* from making any alteration; but he could not prohibit those whose authority was equal to his own. As to the alterations that were subsequently adopted, they arose from various readings in the several MSS. that were inspected. Now although when the MSS. of Scripture differ, *Protestants*, who admit of no visible unerring authority, cannot be secure of the true reading of the Bible put into their hands, yet *we*, who acknowledge a Church with which Christ has promised to be to the end of time, and to keep it from error, *we* are secure that the variations in our Scriptures are concerning matters of little consequence; that is, that there are not among them any of such moment as to lead to errors on points of faith and morality.

My Rev. opponent returned to the objection advanced by Mr. Lyons that we place tradition above Scripture. He does not indeed pretend, (as at first I understood him,) that I had expressly so stated; but he tells me that it is a consequence from my reasoning. I deny that consequence altogether, and the validity of the argument, whereon he sought to establish it. This argument was grounded upon an erroneous understanding of the meaning of some Catholics who have said that the written word depends upon the unwritten. Now this is true, *in some instances*; for, as I observed in my opening speech, in certain points the written word is very obscure, and of this I am prepared to produce undeniable evidence, though I shall not do so, because no reply being allowed I wish not to act unfairly. There are, you must admit, some instances in which the obscurity of Scripture is palpable, and I affirm that one of the advantages of tradition is to clear up the obscurity of the written word. We do not, however, teach that the meaning of the written depends upon the unwritten word, on *all points* of doctrine, but on *some only*. Let Mr. T. or any one look at our books of religious instruction, or examine our theological treatises, and he will find that Scripture alone upon many points suffices to prove our doctrines; and, that on others, although we have recourse to tradition, it is not as being superior to the written word, but as explaining more satisfactorily the meaning thereof.

Mr. T. allows my declaration to go forth to the world that, amongst Roman Catholics, there is no prohibition against marriage. Yes; but let it go forth with the explanation which I gave: that we look not upon *marriage* as

forbidden, but we look upon that man as *guilty of a crime who breaks the vow of continency which he has made to the Lord*. When a man, after having seriously reflected upon the obligations of celibacy, and having solemnly engaged before God to fulfil those obligations, violates his solemn engagement, then we hold that he commits a crime; not because marriage is dishonourable or sinful (for we reverence Scripture, and Scripture calls the state of marriage honourable,) but because it is criminal not to pay our vows to the Most High.

Mr. T. tells us that the Church of England does not prohibit fasting: but it goes further, *it prescribes fasting, and appoints certain days whereon fasting and abstinence are to be observed*. If, then, the quotation from Timothy be applicable to us, it is applicable to the Established Church also; but it applies not to one or the other, because we neither of us enjoin fasting as absolutely necessary to salvation, nor do Catholics say that any meats are in themselves impure, but we hold, as the members of the Church of England must hold, according to their Book of Common Prayer, that fasting is lawful, that it is useful, and that it is obligatory to comply with the legitimate commands of the church, which for good motives hath enjoined fasting. Protestants and Catholics agree upon these points *in principle*, therefore they ought also to agree *in practice*.

Mr. T. appealed to 2 Pet. i. 19, 20. “We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place—until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts; knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation.” Of this passage of the inspired Epistle you have heard Mr. Tottenham’s exposition. But it admits of a different interpretation, which does not militate against the Catholic doctrine; and by a leading principle of the Reformation Society, which authorizes the meanest outcast of society to interpret the written word of God, I am entitled to prefer that interpretation which is, moreover, confirmed by the approbation of several Protestant Commentators. According to this, the meaning of the Apostle merely is, that prophecy is more sure than miracles; for miracles may deceive us, inasmuch as we may sometimes mistake for them diabolical works; but with regard to prophecy there is no such danger.

To the testimony of St. Peter, in evidence of the obscurity of Scripture, Mr. Tottenham replies that the Apostle

does not *prohibit* the reading of the Epistles of St. Paul, although he does acknowledge that there are in them many obscurities and difficulties, which he says “the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction.” If Mr. T. does not see a *prohibition* in this passage, he at least will see a *warning*; and a warning against the danger to be apprehended from reading certain portions of a work, is equivalent, under many circumstances, to a prohibition.—This leads me to consider an objection which has been urged against the prohibition of reading the Scriptures contained in the rules of the Index. Mr. T. maintains that no man can be authorized to prohibit the reading of the sacred word; but his assertion is not warranted by any declaration of holy writ. We maintain that a Church was appointed by Christ; we maintain by the express words of Christ, that he who does not hear his Church, should be likened unto an heathen man and a publican; we maintain that this Church, thus constituted by Christ, and endowed with the Spirit of God, is the Roman Catholic Church, therefore we justly hold that it has authority to prescribe what is useful for its followers. Now, the Catholic Church, seeing that the Scriptures at the time of the Reformation were distorted by a variety of explanations, which not only exposed many to the danger of damnation, menaced by Christ in Mark xvi. 16, but also that those various interpretations were dangerous to the well-being of society, made a *temporary provision* against the indiscriminate reading of the word of God by the people; *but it left discretionary authority with those who were best capable of judging of the danger or utility that individuals might derive from it*, namely, their pastors, to allow the reading of the Scriptures to all those to whom it would not be personally dangerous. This *temporary prohibition* does not now exist in this country; the Scriptures are unrestricted, and I have read to you an extract from a letter of Pius the 6th, in which he not only approves of the printing of the Scriptures in the vernacular tongue, but *he recommends the reading of them by the Laity*.

I could substantiate by other proofs the lawfulness of the practice of the Church, in prohibiting the indiscriminate reading of the Scriptures under certain circumstances. I might refer to the practice of the Jewish Church, which practice Christ did not condemn. The Jewish Church did not tolerate the reading of every part of the Scriptures



to those to whom it might be dangerous ; young men, till they arrived at the age of thirty, were not allowed to read the Book of Canticles and certain other portions, because it was apprehended that it might be perilous to them. Look also at the evils that have actually arisen from this universal reading of the Scriptures ; so that unless the absolute necessity of their being open to indiscriminate perusal be established by proofs as clear as the sun at noon-day, (and I have not heard any such adduced,) it is natural to conclude that there must be authority in the Church to prevent this indiscriminate reading.

If we look, first, at the condition of Protestant Germany, Germany the cradle of the Reformation, as its present condition is described in four sermons preached in 1825 before the University of Cambridge, by the Rev. Mr. Rose, a Clergyman of the Established Church, who had been sent over to Germany to investigate the state of the faith in the Protestant Churches of that country, we have set before us details of infidelity, that are enough to make a man's hair stand on end. Mr. Rose tells us of Professors of Divinity, of those who are pastors of the people—of those who are the highest in Ecclesiastical dignity, holding doctrines and maintaining interpretations of Scripture, which are worse than any thing that one could have imagined. There are some who endeavour to resolve into natural causes and effects, all the miracles of Christ. *We* read that he walked upon the water ; but *they* tell you that the Greek particle *ἐπὶ* means simply that Christ walked on the land *by* the water's side. *We* read in Scripture of a man cured by Christ of the palsy ; *they* tell you that Christ only replaced a dislocated joint. *We* read of Christ directing Peter to find the tribute money in the mouth of a fish ; one of the learned Protestant Professors of Germany, Paulus, tells us that there was no miracle in this, that Peter was only enjoined to catch a fish, and *from the sale* of it provide the tribute money. Are not these melancholy instances of the danger arising from the indiscriminate use of the Bible ? These Protestant Divines go much further, (for however they may be disowned by you, yet they are entitled to the appellation of Protestants : 1st, because they protest against the Catholic Church ; and, 2dly, because they maintain that the Bible is the only Rule of Faith, and that each man's judgment is the only authority to which he must submit in ascertaining its meaning) ; these men have gone to such extremes



as to deny that Christ was the Messiah, or a Prophet; some have placed him a little above Mahomet, and others have asserted that he was inferior to that impostor. Such are consequences of the unlimited perusal of the inspired volume.

Listen to the following extract from a Protestant author, the Rev. Mr. O'Callaghan, in a work entitled, "Thoughts on the Tendency of Bible Societies, as affecting the Established Church and Christianity itself, as a reasonable service :"—

"In opposition to the Church of Rome, the first Reformer loudly and justly asserted the right of private judgment in expounding the Scriptures. Duly understood there is no right more certain than this; but anxious to emancipate the people from the authority of the Roman Pontiff, they proclaimed it without explanation or restriction, and the consequences were dreadful. . . . But if the flagitious madness of foreign peasants, interpreting the Bible for themselves, be afflicting to the friends of humanity and rational piety, the history of England, during a considerable part of the seventeenth century, offers little to console them. At this time, prayer and preaching and reading the Scriptures were at their height; Scripture authority was pleaded for every atrocity. Words of high and sacred import were polluted by the vulgar lips of ignorant Enthusiasts. . . . These historical facts have often astonished the good, and startled the pious. Engrossed by such feelings, the reader too often overlooks their awful moral, that *the Bible without note or comment, is unfit for the perusal of the rude and illiterate.* Misunderstanding its meaning, and misapplying its precepts, they will employ it to countenance every ruling passion, and sanctify every favourite vice. *What has happened before, may happen again; and, therefore, the Bible Society are called upon to pause, and calmly consider their plan of religious instruction, lest, instead of pure Christianity, they circulate hypocrisy, fanaticism, and impious delusions among the lower classes of society.*"

Accordingly the work of Mr. Rose, who had attentively examined the religious condition of Germany, shows us that the infidelity of that country is chiefly owing to the indiscriminate use of the Bible interpreted by each one's private judgment; and he says, pp. 215, 216, that many who trembled at the rapid progress of infidelity, sought to save themselves by returning to the Church of Rome. The Rev. Mr. Phelan, a Protestant Clergyman, quoted p. 81 of "Reflections, &c." by the Rev. Mr. Wix, Curate of St. Bartholomew the Less, speaks thus on the subject:—

"In the first place, the united Church does not maintain that all the disputes between her children and the sectaries can be determined satisfactorily by the Bible alone. In support of episcopacy, infant baptism, and some other tenets, she refers to the concurrent voice of antiquity, and the universal practice of the primitive Church, as historical comments upon the inspired volume. In truth the Dissenters have completely overreached Churchmen in drawing them into a league, of which it appears to be a principle, that *the Bible without note or comment is all-sufficient for the determination of religious controversy*; though I cannot but believe that several persons nominally of the national religion, were perfectly aware how much they conceded when they joined the fallacious confederacy."

Hence the Rev. Mr. Wix writes, p. 80 :—

“ It was not contemplated by the early Reformers, who, disgusted with the multifarious errors of boasted tradition, asserted that ‘ Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith ;’ (6th Article of the Church of England,) that the time would arrive when every individual with the Bible in his hands, would consider himself qualified and justified to form his own faith, and to reject all that had been concluded on in the piety and learning of his ancestors, which did not accord with his own notions ; but now this folly, this pride, this worse than folly and pride united, has prevailed to the alarming extent, that each person considers himself at full liberty to form or to choose whatever faith he pleases, and to deny doctrines, however plainly revealed, which are above his comprehension. Thus, in the profaneness of reason, unchastised by the admonition and teaching of Divine Revelation and ancient persuasion, the prominent articles of Christian faith are denied by those who call themselves the disciples of the meek and humble Jesus.”

Ought not, therefore, the members of the Established Church to pause, ere they put into the hands of the people the Bible without comment, preaching up at the same time the uncontrollable right of every man to put upon it his own interpretation? Ought they not to pause before they join the Reformation Society, in setting this forth as a leading principle, that “ every meanest outcast is *commanded* to exercise his judgment upon the meaning of the contents of the sacred volume?” Mr. T. says, that the ministers of the Established Church do not exclude persons from receiving instruction. But I maintain that herein they act contrary to their declared principles ; for if every man is *commanded* to exercise *his own* judgment upon the meaning of the contents of Scripture, as this command can come from no other than God, who is above the Reformation Society and all mankind ; if, I say, there be such a *divine command*, then those are guilty of interfering with the order instituted by the Almighty, who attempt to give a bias to the understandings of others by unwarranted instruction, instead of leaving them to the exercise of their own private judgments.

Mr. T. rested an argument upon the solicitude with which the Jews endeavoured to secure the Bible from corruptions. In the time of Philo they might have done so, but in Justin’s time they did not ; for, in his dialogue with Trypho, he censures the Jews for several corruptions which they had maliciously introduced into the sacred volume.

You have heard from Mr. Tottenham that Catholic doctors differed in their interpretation of the decrees of the Council of Trent, and he named Soto and Vega, Bellarmine and Catharinus, who he said entertained opposite doc-

trines. But let me repeat what I said before ; they differed not on doctrines of *faith*, not upon doctrines which the Catholic Church *had defined* ; upon all *defined matters*, Soto and Vega, Bellarmine and Catharinus, professed one same creed with the rest of the Church, or, for the preservation of unity, they would have been rejected therefrom. They disputed, therefore, but merely upon *scholastic questions* ; upon *opinions* which were left to the inquiry of any individual. For the Roman Catholic Church exercises no tyranny over the minds of men ; it only puts forth its authoritative definitions, when the necessity of maintaining unity makes it essential that the Church should determine on certain points, what is and what is not to be believed.

Mr. T. urged against us, in the course of the discussion, the oft-quoted conduct of the Bereans, in Acts xvii. 11, 12.

“ They were more noble than those of Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so. Therefore many of them believed : also of honourable women which were Greeks, and of men, not a few.”

Now the conclusion to which Mr. Tottenham applies this quotation, viz. :—*that the Bible is the only rule of faith*, is by no means proved therefrom. The Jews of Thessalonica rejected the testimonies alleged from Scripture by St. Paul, without examining “ whether those things were so,” and are therefore justly condemned, whilst the Jews of Berea, “ who searched the Scriptures daily,” are commended : *so we*, without implying thereby that the Bible is the only rule of faith, commend those who differ from us when they search the Scriptures whether the testimonies we allege from them be so, and are thus led to believe our doctrines, rather than those who refuse even to examine the proofs upon which our doctrines rest.

It has been argued that St. Paul did not refer the Jews to tradition ; but let it be borne in mind, that Christian traditions, of which alone we are disputing, the Bereans would refuse to admit ;—that therefore, St. Paul must have appealed to Scripture, and not to such traditions, which only commenced with the oral instructions of the Apostles, and would not, on that account, serve to convince the Jews.

It has been also remarked that Christ rebuked the Devil by Scripture only and not by tradition. But for this it was sufficient that, on such an occasion, the testimony of tradition might have been less suitable than that of Scripture. *We too* refer to the Scripture alone, on those occasions wherein we have no sufficient evidence in tradition ; and

on other occasions, when we might appeal to the authority of tradition, we sometimes content ourselves with referring only to the written word.

You were told that Christ himself condemned the traditions of the Pharisees. So do *we* condemn the traditions of *men*. Borrowing the distinction which Mr. T. made between the *modum tradendi*; and the *res traditæ*, I wish to observe that *we too* think those guilty of a monstrous violation of that reverence which is due to the Scriptures, who admit as of equal authority with them, the traditions of men, meaning that the *res traditæ*, the things delivered, are of *men*; for our traditions can be called the traditions of men only as to the *modum tradendi*, because *by means of men* they come down to us; but the *res traditæ*, the things handed down, which are admitted as a portion of our belief, are not of men, but proceed *from God himself*.

John xx. 30, 31. has also been repeatedly objected to us, and has been again and again discussed. I still maintain that the argument deduced therefrom by the advocates of Protestantism is a mere delusion. Like them we profess that “those things were written that we might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God;” we profess too that belief in Christ the Son of God is one of the primary essential doctrines of the new law; but what we maintain is that neither this text, nor any other that has been alleged declares, clearly and precisely, that there are *no doctrines* handed down by Christ, *besides those* which are contained *in the written word*; and this is the real question which I have endeavoured to keep before you. If there be a single revealed truth, whether amongst the primarily essential, or amongst the less essential doctrines of Christian revelation; whether you consider that a man can *absolutely* be saved without its belief, or not; yet if it be duly proposed to any one and rejected, however unessential it may appear, that moment he exposes himself to damnation: for Christ has declared without restriction, “he that believeth not shall be damned.”

Let me now offer a few remarks on the arguments that have been adduced on the other side, on the manner they have been replied to in ours, and on the course of reasoning which has been adopted by us. I still contend, therefore, and the printed Report will satisfy you whether I am correct or not, that Mr. T. evaded the principal position which he ought to have established, namely, that *all the revelations* communicated by Christ for the belief of his Disciples are contained *in the Bible only*. That is what he started with:

that *no doctrine* had been handed down by Christ for the benefit of his Church in future times, but what is contained in the Bible. Now, instead of establishing this point, you will find that he endeavoured to mislead you ; sometimes even by misrepresenting my sentiments.

He has been endeavouring to put me in opposition to the Council of Trent, but I am sure my friends who surround me do not think that he has succeeded, and I trust next week to convince you that the Council of Trent is not at variance with my statements, on the points whereon we are said to differ. —My Rev. opponent has likewise endeavoured to persuade you, by instancing Belarmine and others, that there have been divisions among Catholic divines. In my reply I have shewed you what was the nature of their differences, and that they did not turn on any matter of Catholic faith. You have been told that there are errors in our Scriptures. I shewed by the evidence of the Rev. Mr. Curtis that there are gross corruptions of the text, in your translation, whereas in our versions the alleged variations do not, in a single instance, amount to a matter of any consequence ; they arise solely from the different reading of MSS., without once affecting a doctrine of divine faith.

Mr. T. rejected the explanations which I gave from Protestant commentators on the Bible, and the authority also of Protestant divines, supporting in many instances the arguments which I adduced. I know that he is not bound by them ; I know that according to his own principles he, as well as “ every meanest outcast in society,” is authorized to put his own interpretation on the word of God ; but it is a strong argument in my favour, that, while the Catholic Church and all its followers maintain but one faith, the ministers of the Protestant Church, its bishops, divines, and commentators, as well as the ignorant members thereof, are so extremely divided amongst themselves, that many of them in the sincerity of their hearts, when not carried away by their prejudices against the Catholic Church, have maintained against their brethren the very doctrines which that Church professes.

What, on the other hand, was the method which I had purposed to adopt ? It was my intention to adhere closely to the matter proposed for controversy, and not to have quitted it until the close, had I not been, sometimes, almost compelled to do so by the taunts of my opponents. I am not conscious, however, that I have sought to evade any dif-

ficulties, and in this last speech I trust I have met, as far as my time has allowed, those that are considered the most important. I should indeed have attended to them earlier, but knowing that it would be expected of me not to introduce any new topic into my concluding speech, I thought that it might be well employed in refuting former objections.

*My* course of argument has been this. I proposed to establish four points. First, I argued that the Protestant rule was not supported upon proofs either evident or presumptive: *evident* proofs there are not; and *presumptive* proofs would indeed go far enough to establish *moral* certitude, but *not the certitude of divine faith*. For I must repeat that although divine faith may be said to include, yet it is far above moral certitude, which cannot attain to that degree of security whereon divine faith places the man who relies upon it. *Divine faith* rests upon nothing else than the unerring word of God; and is incompatible with even the least *apprehension of error*, with which moral certitude is accompanied; it cannot, therefore, rely upon mere presumptive evidence. I shewed, moreover, that presumptive evidence was against the Protestant rule. For this purpose I appealed to the conduct of the Apostles:—also to the conduct of the primitive Christians, who manifested no solicitude to diffuse the Scriptures; who took no pains to translate the Scriptures; and for whom, in a word, it was impossible that the rule of faith, could have been *the Scriptures alone*, because it was neither *possible* for the multitude of primitive Christians to obtain sufficient copies for that purpose, considering the difficulty and expense of purchasing them, nor if obtained could the immense majority read them.

I then proceeded to my second point, that Scripture itself authorizes tradition. First, I proved that it was impossible for *all* the doctrines of revelation to be contained in Scripture. This argument instead of being fairly met, was continually evaded by your being told, what I never questioned, that all *essentials* are contained in the written word. But, replied my opponents, “what has become of the other revealed truths, which you maintain not to be contained therein?” I have shewn you what became of many; for even Protestants themselves hold several articles of belief, which they cannot substantiate by Scripture alone. It cannot, however, be required necessary of me to enumerate all the revealed doctrines preserved by tradition. It is sufficient



that we, according to our principles, are not implicated in any difficulty concerning them ; for at the same time that we maintain tradition as forming a part of our rule of faith, we hold that there is an unerring visible authority, which makes known to us, as circumstances may require, such doctrines of tradition as we ought to admit among our articles of belief, and by the help of which we may ascertain the true meaning of the written word.

Next I passed to other proofs from Scripture, shewing that the Apostles did not propose to themselves to commit all the doctrines of revelation to writing, but reserved many for oral instruction ; that this oral instruction was called, in Scripture, *tradition* ; that means were taken by the Apostle Paul to hand down to coming times certain oral communications, by means *of men*, and *not by writing* ; and I called, in support of my proofs, the evidence of Protestant commentators of considerable weight amongst those of their own communion.

Then I proceeded to establish, by an *argumentum ad hominem*, which presses against the leading principle of those I am contending with that, *by their own admission, Scripture alone* cannot be the only rule of faith. In order to demonstrate this, I did not deny the canonicity of the books of Scripture ; it was not necessary for me to deny a single one of the points of faith which our Protestant friends hold in common with us : I only contend that, *according to their principles*, they cannot establish, *except by tradition*, several doctrines, which those at least are obliged to maintain, who admit the Book of Common Prayer. In the course of my observations I also exhibited Protestants in opposition to each other, upon important points ; nay upon the necessary doctrine of baptism. This argument was met by an attempt to shew that *we* support infant baptism by Scripture, which was not solving my objection ; besides I have reminded my opponents that although in support of infant baptism we adduce Scripture, as containing *confirmatory* proofs of its validity, yet that our main proofs rest upon tradition ; and I quoted several Protestant divines to the same purpose. But my time is near its close, and compels me to abandon any further review of the line of argument which I have pursued.

In conclusion, permit me to propose to your serious reflection, how the Protestant system, which authorizes such latitude of belief amongst its members, can constitute that faith which must be, according to the declaration of



St. Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians, “*One*,” as there is but “*one* Lord, and *one* baptism?” Can a heterogeneous compound of discordant believers, all of whom are termed *Protestants*, be that Church which Christ promised should be *one*, as he and the Father are one. John xvii. 32? Can Protestantism be a sound faith, and yet St. Paul teach sound doctrine in Gal. chap. v. where he enumerates “variances, strifes, and heresies among the works of the flesh,” which exclude from the kingdom of heaven? How, in the Protestant faith, can be verified the promises of Christ, that he will be with his church to the end of time, and that the Holy Spirit shall teach it all truth? Matt. xxviii. 20. John xiv. 16. How shall a Church that is so divided against itself be the kingdom of God? since Christ declared, Matt. xii. 25., that “every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation.” How, in fine, shall that Church which maintains such opposite doctrines, be as described by St. Paul, in 1 Tim. iii. 15. “the pillar and ground of the truth?”

I have now only to add that this is the first occasion whereon, in public controversy, my voice has been addressed to you in defence of the Catholic doctrines; and, unless *compelled* to defend the conscientious belief of Catholics, it will probably be the last. From what you have heard it is your duty to consider, whether Catholic doctrines are those revolting and contradictory absurdities which you have been taught to suppose?—whether Catholics do not endeavour, by the exercise of a sound judgment, to form their faith according to the dictates of reason and revelation? Above all, let me entreat you not to neglect the grace that is now offered you: for, the abuse of grace on this occasion may lead hereafter to reprobation.

I thank sincerely this most respectable audience for the attention with which it has heard me, so different from the manner in which, at other meetings, Catholic advocates have been heard; and I am sure that such conduct cannot fail to be pleasing to the God of all truth, whose interests I have humbly endeavoured to advocate.

---

The CHAIRMAN.—I have the honour to announce to you, that the discussion on the first subject has now been concluded. The second subject, namely, the Sacrifice of the

Mass, will be investigated, if God will, on Wednesday next.

On the motion of the Rev. Mr. MACDONNELL the Chairman then vacated the chair, and was succeeded in his office by J. Hussey, Esq.

THE REV. MR. MACDONNELL.

I have great pleasure, having had much of that experience to which my Rev. friend has alluded, to bear testimony to the difference of conduct manifested by our excellent Chairman, from that manifested by many placed in similar situations. I have very great pleasure in moving that the thanks of the meeting be given to the Chairman.

THE REV. DR. COOMBES, *Roman Catholic Missionary at Shepton-Mallett.*

I second the motion. I think that our approbation is due to the gentleman who has presided, and to the Rev. gentleman on the other side. He has conducted the discussion to his credit, and with uncommon temper and patience. Nothing offensive has been uttered on the other side; every thing courteous has been observed. This is such a perfect contrast between the present discussion, and various religious discussions that have taken place elsewhere, in this country, that I think it may be considered a model. I compliment the Rev. Mr. Tottenham as a person of extreme moderation, and I think the meeting will join with me. We are certainly divided with respect to religious principles, but in other respects, so far as charity and civility, and gentlemanly conduct are concerned, I shall always look upon that gentleman with the highest respect.

THE CHAIRMAN.

I am deeply sensible of the honour you have done me in proposing a vote of thanks, which I feel that I do not deserve. I have humbly, and to the best of my ability, endeavoured to discharge the duties imposed upon me. If I have failed at all, it has been through bodily infirmity, and that trepidation which you may have noticed when I took the Chair. Suffer me to say, in extenuation, that it is the first time I ever had the honour of presiding at a public meeting. I have been a spectator at many, but this is the first occasion on which I have taken the Chair.

But if, indeed, I have been enabled to perform the duties required of me, I cannot take the credit to myself; you will pardon me, and the solemnity of the occasion will justify me, if I say, without fear of the least degree of cant or hypocrisy being imputed to me, that I am fully persuaded I am indebted, in the first place, to Him, whose providence has placed me in this most responsible situation; and it is a curious coincidence, which you will permit me to notice, that the rules which I have read, and by which this discussion has been guided, are dated on the day of my birth. But having acknowledged the first source, whence I derived power to attain the approbation which you, in your courtesy, have expressed, allow me to say, secondly, that I am indebted to yourselves—to you, gentlemen, who have so ably and so eloquently defended your respective systems; and, thirdly, to the meeting at large. It may appear trifling to use the simile, but, in truth, you have made me little better than a *time-piece*. My duty I have endeavoured to discharge faithfully, and it has been my delight and privilege to act with the utmost impartiality; nay, even to command my looks, lest there should appear to be some irregularity in the vibrations of the *pendulum*. Such is the humble instrument I have most resembled. The pendulum is, however, now at rest, and I cannot vibrate on either side; my duties are at an end; but, if it please God, I will resume the Chair again on Wednesday next, should it be your good pleasure.

In conclusion, permit me to say that this has been the most orderly meeting I ever witnessed, and is worthy the imitation of every meeting in this great land, and from one extremity of the British Empire to the other, I trust it will be duly appreciated.

*Thus ended the Discussion on the “RULE OF FAITH.”*

**DISCUSSION AT DOWNSIDE,**  
**ON THE**  
**SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.**



THE  
**DISCUSSION AT DOWNSIDE.**

---

FOURTH DAY.—*Wednesday, March 5th, 1834.*

---

SUBJECT:  
**THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.**

THE CHAIRMAN, on taking the Chair, said, Ladies and Gentlemen, as there are probably some now present, who did not take any part in the discussion of the first subject, perhaps it may be well for me to detain you a few moments whilst I read again the rules by which the discussion is to be regulated.

(The Hon. Gentleman then read the Rules.)

THE REV. T. J. BROWN.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, — The matter upon which I am now invited to address you is indeed of vital importance; and I feel sensibly the awful responsibility which I take upon myself, when I come forward to advocate, concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass, the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. It is a matter I have said of vital importance; for it was upon this point, principally, that the Calvinists rested the lawfulness of their separation from the Roman Catholic Church. That Church they said, could not be the Church of Christ, which was involved in an error so great as is implied by the doctrine of the Real Presence, and the Sacrifice of the Mass: it had thereby, they alleged, fallen into idolatry, for a length of time, and thus, not having been supported by the promises of Christ, the Roman Catholic Church could not be the true Church.—I feel full well all the difficulties of my present situation: I know that there are arrayed against us prejudices conceived almost in infancy, prejudices which have been nourished in maturer years,

prejudices which have been confirmed even by old age. How then shall I apply myself to my task? It is, by entreating, in the first place, that you will, as much as possible, divest yourselves of any preconceived notions, respecting those points of Catholic doctrine which I am about to develope. Yet I am fully sensible that it will be extremely difficult for you, if not impossible, so far to free yourselves from those cherished prejudices of your early and riper years, as that they shall place no obstacle in the way of my doing justice to my cause.

My duty prescribes that, in the first place, I should lay before you the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church; and if that doctrine appear unreasonable and absurd, I bid you recollect that it is the doctrine, not of a small portion only of Christendom, but, of by far the largest portion; that it is the doctrine which was maintained by the whole Church before Protestantism made its appearance; that it is the doctrine of Christianity from the east even unto the west; finally, that it is the same doctrine which was held by such men as Pascal, Bossuet, Fenelon, and Descartes, by men distinguished in different countries and in different ages, by their soundness of understanding, and the acquisitions which they made in every science. Do not then, at the outset, condemn me as advocating an absurdity.

I beg also to observe that before proceeding to establish directly the Catholic belief concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass, it is necessary that I should satisfy you fully concerning *another* very essential doctrine; and Mr. T. is well aware of the necessity under which I labour of advocating the real presence of Christ upon our altars, as well as the sacrifice which we make of him thereon. When, indeed, we first met to propose this discussion, I was of opinion that those dogmas were not so essentially connected, but that Mr. T. might be satisfied with bringing his objections against the Sacrifice of the Mass alone. As however, he thought differently, I am willing that our doctrine of the real presence shall be fairly controverted, as well as that of the Sacrifice which we offer; and consequently I shall first establish that part of our Creed which relates to the former subject.

Our doctrine on the Real Presence is stated by the Council of Trent, Session 13, cap. 1:—

“The Holy Synod openly and plainly professes, that, in the sacrament of the Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially present under the



appearance of those sensible objects. Nor in this is there any repugnance; that Christ, according to his natural manner of existence, should always remain in heaven at the right hand of his Father, and that at the same time, he should be present with us, in many places, really, but sacramentally, in that way of existence which, though in words we can hardly express it, the mind, illuminated by faith, can conceive to be possible to God, and which we are bound firmly to believe. For so all our forefathers—as many as were members of the true Church of Christ—who wrote on the subject of this Holy Sacrament, openly professed.”

This doctrine of the Council of Trent is confirmed in a small Catholic work entitled:—“Roman Catholic Principles,” which I have here, and from which I shall read the following short extract:—

“Christ is not present in this sacrament, according to his natural way of existence; that is, as bodies naturally exist; but in a manner proper to the character of his exalted and glorified body. His presence then is real and substantial, but sacramental; not exposed to the external senses, nor obnoxious to corporal contingencies.”

This is the real doctrine of Catholics, with respect to the manner of Christ's presence in the sacrament of the altar; and I doubt not that it conveys to your minds, a notion of our doctrine, very different, in many respects, from that in which it has hitherto been conceived by you. The objections which will probably be brought against this part of our belief, will lead to its further development.

The belief of Catholics concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass is correctly stated in the same work from which I read the last quotation:—

“Our Saviour in leaving to us his body and blood, under two distinct species or kinds, instituted not only a Sacrament, but also a Sacrifice; a commemorative sacrifice, distinctly shewing his passion and death until he come. For as the sacrifice of the cross was performed by a distinct effusion of his blood, so is that sacrifice commemorated in this of the altar by a distinction of the symbols. Jesus, therefore, is here given not only to us, but for us; and the Church is thereby enriched with a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice, usually termed the Mass: propitiatory we say, because representing, in a lively manner the passion and death of our Lord, it is peculiarly pleasing to our eternal Father, and thus more effectually applies to us the all-sufficient merits of the sacrifice of the cross.”

I subjoin one other quotation from Sect. 14 of the “Exposition of Catholic Doctrines,” by Bossuet, as tending more efficaciously than the extract which I have just given, to remove any erroneous impressions which you may entertain with regard to our true doctrine on the question before you.

“The Church is so far from believing, that any thing is wanting to the sacrifice of the cross, that she deems it, on the contrary, so perfectly and so fully sufficient, that whatever is afterwards added, has been instituted to celebrate its memory, and to apply its virtue. We acknowledge, that all the merits of the redemption of mankind is derived from the death of the Son of God: when,

therefore, in the celebration of the divine mysteries, we say : We offer to Thee this holy victim ; *we pretend not by this oblation, to make or to present to God a new payment of the price of our salvation ; but to offer to him, in our behalf, the merits of Jesus Christ present, and that infinite price which he once paid for us upon the cross.*"

Thus, then, in the sacrifice of the altar we do not offer a new sacrifice ; nor do we seek to supply any deficiencies in the sacrifice of the cross. We believe that, so far as regards the price of our redemption, the one sacrifice of the cross was fully sufficient ; but by the sacrifice of the altar we hold that there *is applied to us*, in a more perfect manner than by our prayers or by our other good works, the merits of that *one* sacrifice.

Having truly stated the doctrine of Catholics on those two important points, I come to the proofs by which our belief is substantiated. Hereafter it will be my duty to lay before you the arguments whereon we build our doctrine of the nature and efficacy of the Sacrifice of the Mass ; at present I must begin by establishing the Real Presence. For if I am able once to convince you of the truth of the Catholic creed on this point, namely, that we have upon our altars Jesus Christ, truly, really, and substantially present, not indeed after the manner of a *natural* body, but after an *invisible, spiritualized, and sacramental* manner, then there will be much less difficulty in satisfying you upon the offering which we make of him to his eternal Father, and the ends for which we make that offering. Let me, then, claim your earnest attention to the proofs which I am about to adduce.

Those proofs are so manifest in Scripture, regarding the questions proposed for discussion, that were we to hold with Protestants the written word to be the only rule of faith, yet by it alone would they be sufficiently demonstrated. They may, indeed, be illustrated and supported by an appeal to the belief of the Church in the primitive, and subsequent ages ; but to my view " the Real Presence," and " the Sacrifice of the Mass " can be clearly substantiated by the written word. I proceed therefore to argue therefrom.

The first proof to which I direct your attention, is the 6th chap. of the Gospel of St. John, which contains, as we expound it, the promise made by Christ of bestowing hereafter upon men, his body and blood. Now I beg your serious attention to the language held by our blessed Saviour in this chapter, and to the arguments which it furnishes. In all ages it has been expounded, as I am going to

expound it to you, although amongst ancient Catholics there may have been a few,—they were very *few*,—who have taken a different view from that which I am about to propose. To Protestants in these latter times, however, it was reserved to contest with vehemence the meaning of this chapter, and it is my duty to vindicate the ancient exposition of the language of our divine Master, by such arguments as I trust will make an adequate impression on your minds.

In the early part of this chapter we read of a splendid miracle performed by our Saviour. He fed 5,000 men with five barley loaves and two small fishes; and after all were satisfied there remained twelve baskets of fragments. Subsequently to this miracle, the Jews sought to make him their king, but he crossed the water and proceeded to Capernaum. On the following morning he was met by the same multitude, in whose presence, and for whom he had worked that splendid prodigy. The 25th verse commences with a discourse of our divine Saviour to them, upon which we cannot too much and too seriously meditate. In the 26th and 27th verses, our blessed Lord blames the avidity with which they sought for material food:—

“Ye seek me,” says he, “not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled. Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life.”

Having thus blamed their eagerness after material food, he proceeds, in the 29th verse, to inculcate the necessity of faith in him whom God had sent. In the 32nd, 33rd, and 34th verses, he extols the admirable excellency of a bread which he came from heaven to bestow; and he exalts it far above the bread which was given to their fathers in the desert. In the 35th verse he call *himself the bread of life*:—

“I am that bread of life; he that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst;”

but *in what sense* he is the bread of life, he does *not yet* expound, and we must look hereafter for a clearer manifestation of his meaning. In the 36th verse he reproaches his hearers with their want of faith. In the 37th, 44th and 45th verses he insists anew upon the absolute necessity of divine grace. In verses 37, 38, 39, 40, 44, and 46 he appeals to his divine origin, whereon he establishes the most secure motives of his credibility. In the 47th verse again, he insists on the necessity of belief in him—

“Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life.”

You have observed that hitherto, although he has declared that he is the bread of life, yet he has not clearly expounded in what sense he is to be so understood ; but that, with great energy, he appeals repeatedly to their faith, refers them to his celestial origin, and insists on his divine mission from his Father. What means this solemn exordium ; this gradual and imposing introduction of the doctrine which he is about to propose ? Is there, then, something which he is about to manifest, that will be extremely difficult of belief ? We shall soon see whether there is not reason to presume that our divine Saviour had some such difficulty in view, which he thus gradually and cautiously introduced.

I wish moreover to observe that, the method, almost always adopted by our heavenly Teacher, is distantly to announce any great mystery which he intends hereafter to propose, or to accomplish. Thus we find in the 3rd chap. of St. John's Gospel, that he prepares his Disciples for the mystery of baptism,—which he instituted subsequently to his resurrection :—

“ Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.”

In this very 6th chap. of John, he forewarns his hearers of his future ascension ; and frequently he directs the attention of his Apostles to his approaching sufferings, to his resurrection, to his ascension into heaven, and the descent of the Holy Ghost : miraculous events which were hereafter to be accomplished. Now the motives why our divine Saviour thus announces beforehand the mysteries which afterwards he fulfilled are, amongst others, in the first place, that he might fix upon a firm foundation the faith of his hearers in those mysteries, when they should witness their future fulfilment ; secondly, that he might raise their minds to an eager expectation of the accomplishment of his predictions ; thirdly, that thereby, he might consult the weakness of man by sparing him the too lively impressions which would be made upon his senses by suddenly placing before him such splendid prodigies. Is there, then, I repeat, any great mystery in this chapter, which Christ is now about to propose, and which is hereafter to be completed ? His manner naturally leads us to expect it, and the more we examine his words, the more we shall find them warrant that persuasion.

I have pointed out the strong motives upon which Christ

claimed the unbounded confidence of his audience ; his appeals to his mission, to his miracles, to his divine origin : let us now listen to the announcement of the doctrine itself, to which this exordium leads. I invite your attention to the 51st verse :—

“ I am the living bread which came down from heaven ; if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever ; and *the bread that I will give is my flesh*, which I will give for the life of the world.”

There can be no doubt as to the literal meaning of the words which Jesus Christ has just announced : “ The bread that I will give is *my flesh*.” The only question, therefore, to be submitted to you, to me, and to all the followers of Christ, is, are these words to be explained *figuratively* ? or, are they to be understood *literally* ? It is said by Protestants in general, (for I except the Lutherans who agree on this point with Catholics,) that by these words Christ signifies that he will give us to partake of his flesh, after a figurative manner only. But, I put it to your common sense, whether we, at this distance of time, are better able to comprehend the real meaning of Christ, than were the Capernaïtes and his disciples who were present ? Surely they were better able to judge than we can of his meaning, by his looks, by the tone of voice in which he addressed them, and by various other circumstances.

What then, I ask, is the sense in which he was understood by the Capernaïtes, and by his disciples ? Let us look at the 52nd verse :—

“ The Jews therefore strove among themselves saying, *How can this man give us his flesh to eat ?*”

From these words it is, indeed, quite clear, that the Capernaïtes understood the words of Christ, not in a *figurative*, but a *literal* sense ; they understood that he promised to give them *really and substantially his flesh to eat*. Such was the only interpretation which they could give to them. And hence sprung their sin ; that instead of relying upon the divinity and power of Jesus Christ, as *to the manner* in which his words, taken literally, were to be fulfilled, they only attended to the vain and foolish suggestions of human reason. They did not conceive any other manner in which *flesh* could be given them *to eat*, than after a *raw and bloody* manner, such as they had seen it in the shambles ; or as it was served up at their meals, cooked and dressed. They understood distinctly the words

of Christ to convey to them a promise, that he would bestow his flesh truly and substantially ; but they undertook to explain *the precise manner* in which they were to receive his flesh, and hence they said : “ How can this man give us his flesh to eat ? ”

Without meaning any offence, allow me to call your attention to two important observations. When the Catholic doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament has been announced to you, how have you received it ? Have you rejected it merely because your rule of faith the Scripture teaches you to reject it ? or have you not repeatedly condemned our doctrine because *you thought it absurd* ? Has it not, I ask, been too frequently thrown aside by Protestants, not because having tried it by the word of God they judged it inconsistent with revelation, but because they said with the Jews : “ *How is it possible that Christ can give us his flesh to eat ? How is it possible that the doctrine can be true which the members of the Roman Church hold ?* ”

Allow me now, that I may better elucidate this matter, to change for a moment the scene. Suppose a delegate of the Reformation Society addressing an ignorant audience, and that he is expounding to them the 6th chapter of St. John ; that in the course of this exposition he discovers himself to be misunderstood ; that his audience, instead of receiving the meaning of this chapter as it is received by Protestants generally, and as this organ of the Reformation Society wishes it to be received, a portion at least of his ignorant hearers are scandalized at the sense which they attribute to his words. I will suppose that they understand them as the Roman Catholics, and the vast body of Christians have in all ages, and do at this moment ; and that, offended thereat, they ask : “ How is it possible for Christ to give us his flesh to eat ? ” What would be the conduct of this organ of the Reformation Society, or of any Protestant minister ? Would he not tell them :— “ You are under a grievous mistake, I do not mean that you are to eat *truly* and *substantially* the flesh of Christ. There is nothing in what I said which you cannot easily comprehend. I speak of eating *in figure only* ; I speak of eating *spiritually* of the body of Christ by *faith alone*, and not truly and in substance.” Is there any preacher of the word of God who, seeing his words so mistaken, as I suppose the meaning to be mistaken of the organ of the Reformation Society, would not immediately think it his

duty thus to correct the error of his hearers? And when he should propose such a correction, how simple and easy of understanding would his doctrine become? For, who can be scandalized, when he hears that he is to partake of Christ's flesh, merely by a mysterious *memorial* in *figure only*, by *faith only*, and not truly, really, and *substantially*. Such as I have described you will acknowledge, would be the conduct of a member of the Reformation Society. Does then Christ, let me ask, thus expound his meaning? Does he correct *the error* into which, if the Protestant interpretation be correct, it is quite evident the Capernaïtes fell? Let us listen to the manner in which, in the 53d verse, Christ explains himself to his mistaken hearers; mistaken, I say, if the Protestant interpretation be right.

“ Then Jesus said unto them, *Verily, verily*, I say unto you, *except ye eat the flesh* of the Son of Man, and *drink his blood*, ye have no life in you.”

Exercising my judgment upon the meaning of this passage of Scripture, I am forcibly struck by the words of Christ my heavenly Instructor. With the missionaries of the Reformation Society, all their explanation of the 51st verse would tend to remove the impression that the words of Christ are to be understood otherwise than *figuratively*; that they are expressive of any thing more than a *spiritual manducation*; but our divine Saviour, who came to announce to ignorant men the truths of revelation, gives no hint whatsoever of a figure; on the contrary, in the subsequent verses he *six times confirms* the literal meaning which his words carried with them in the 51st verse. He must undoubtedly have perceived the great mistake into which the Capernaïtes had fallen, if Protestants are right; yet, instead of even insinuating that there was any mistake, and offering to correct it, he makes it almost impossible for them to suspect that they had misunderstood his meaning. He repeats the same assertion six times; he confirms it not only by the explicit language which he uses, but by the solemn affirmation with which he opens the exposition of his doctrine in the 53rd verse—“ *Verily, verily*, I say unto you, Except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of Man,” &c.

If the Churchman will tell me that, notwithstanding the clear manner in which Christ here expresses himself, his words are to be understood not literally, but figuratively, how, I ask, will he be able to convince the Quaker that the words of Christ are not with equal reason to be under-



stood figuratively, where in the 3rd chap. of St. John's Gospel, he announces the efficacy of that baptism which he was hereafter to institute :—

“ Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God ?”

If in one place we are to regard the express words of our divine Saviour only after a spiritual and figurative manner, by what rule of interpretation are we, in other similar expressions, not to understand his words spiritually and figuratively? How will the Church of England Protestant, with consistency, be able to subvert, by Scripture, the doctrine of the Unitarian? To his argument from that apparently decisive declaration of Christ: “ I and my Father are one,” the Unitarian would be justified in replying that such words are to be understood spiritually and figuratively, meaning only a moral unity. Should the member of the Established Church urge those words of the Eternal Father: “ This is my beloved *Son* in whom I am well pleased,” the Unitarian might answer, that Christ is the beloved Son of God by adoption in a figure, and not in reality. God forbid that *I* should hold such a sentiment, or advocate such a doctrine; my only object is to expose the inconsistency of the generality of Protestants who, by no other authority than their private judgment, make up their contradictory systems of belief by arbitrarily expounding, in a *literal* sense, one portion of Scripture, and *figuratively* another.

There is one more observation which cursorily I glanced at, not long since, and which I think is of such importance for determining our blessed Saviour's meaning, as to demand a further development. If Protestants are *right* in their interpretation of this passage of John, how, I ask, were the Capernaïtes wrong? In what could *their* error consist? They only rejected that which Protestants reject; what *these* considered as absurd and impossible, viz. that Christ should have meant to bestow his flesh and blood truly, and substantially, upon those who receive him, this *they too* considered as absurd and as impossible, and therefore refused to admit it. There is no appearance whatever that the Capernaïtes thought of rejecting, or would have rejected the doctrine of the presence of Christ, understood *after a spiritual manner*; that they would have been scandalized at the manducation of his flesh *in figure only*. I ask therefore wherein consists the error of the Capernaïtes, according to the Protestant interpretation of

Christ's meaning? If the Capernaïtes rejected that only which Protestants reject, and if they did not reject that which Protestants hold, it would follow that, according to Protestants, the Capernaïtes were not guilty of *any error of faith*, but of a *mistake only as to the meaning* of Christ. But if this were the case, would he not have corrected a mere mistake such as this? Indeed we perpetually find that, when his hearers mistook the meaning of his words, or at least when *his disciples* not less than many of the ignorant people mistook them, he failed not to set them right. Is it then to be conceived that in this instance he will leave them in involuntary error? For if He did not intend his language to be received in the sense in which his hearers understood it, but as Protestants now understand it, not of a real but of a *figurative* manducation,—foreseeing in his infinite wisdom that the universal church in future ages would fall into the erroneous meaning in which, as Protestants suppose, the Capernaïtes conceived his doctrine,—he would, according to the ideas of his wisdom and goodness which we are authorised to entertain, have corrected those false impressions. He might by a single word have removed such erroneous notions; and he would not surely have been less indulgent than we may suppose a minister of the Protestant faith would be to his hearers. Now, instead of this indulgence, instead of correcting any supposed error of the Capernaïtes, instead of telling them that he meant his words to be understood in *figure* only, and not in *reality*, he confirms six times, between the 51st and 59th verses their literal meaning. Thus it was impossible for the Jews to understand the language of Christ figuratively, and hence it becomes unreasonable for us to explain it figuratively.

I have been arguing upon the supposition that Protestants are right, and that the Capernaïtes had, therefore, only misunderstood their divine Instructor. I maintain, however, that the Capernaïtes were not simply mistaken as to the principal meaning which they put upon the words of Christ; that, on the contrary, in rejecting that meaning they were actually guilty of *positive unbelief*; and that when they asked, “How can this man give us his flesh to eat?” they, like Protestants, *refused to believe, because they could not understand*. Yes; there was not merely a mistake, but an express act of unbelief on their parts; for if we look into the 64th verse, we find that Christ in direct terms censures them for their want of faith. “But there are some

of you that *believe not*." Now, if the Capernaïtes committed a sin against faith in rejecting Christ's words according to the sense in which they understood them, and as it is quite evident that they understood them in their literal meaning, it follows that the *literal* was their *right meaning*, and that what they thus rejected was the very object of the act of faith which they ought to have formed; that, therefore, the words of Christ are to be understood, not of a mere figurative and spiritual, but of a true, real and substantial manducation.

Let us borrow an illustration from those who reject the union of the human nature of Christ with his Divinity, in the person of the Son of God. Now they are guilty of *unbelief*, only because it is a matter of revelation that Christ is truly and really the Son of God; so that if it were not clearly manifested by divine revelation that he is truly and really the Son of God, they would not be guilty of an error against faith in rejecting his divinity. It follows, in like manner, that the Capernaïtes could not be guilty of unbelief, unless the opposite doctrine,—*that which they rejected, were truly the doctrine which they ought to have believed, and this doctrine is that proposed by the Catholic Church*.

But the Capernaïtes, says an ancient expositor, chose to imagine that the body and blood of Christ could not be substantially given to them, except after that *palpable and carnal manner* which their senses suggested; and hence it was that they rejected his words; whereas, on the contrary, they ought to have grounded their belief on the words of Christ by regarding, not *the manner* which their sensual and carnal imaginations suggested, but exclusively his truth, whose divinity had been manifested in the miracles of which they had been witnesses. So it is with regard to those who at this day dispute the meaning of the doctrine of Christ's presence in the sacrament. That dispute should not turn upon the apparent reasonableness or unreasonableness of his alleged doctrine, but solely on the manifestation or non-manifestation of such doctrine by the word of God. And let me observe that, if the *Capernaïtes* were guilty of a crime in rejecting the doctrine of Christ, because it seemed absurd, notwithstanding the proofs *they* had of his mission and his divinity, Christians who now reject this same doctrine upon a similar vain pretext of its absurdity, having motives of credibility far greater than the Jews had, are much more criminal in the sight of God: for the Jews had

then witnessed some only of his miracles, whereas we Christians have witnessed a variety of more splendid prodigies; the Resurrection of our Redeemer from the dead, his Ascension into heaven, and the miraculous descent of the Holy Ghost to confirm the Apostles and the future Church in the true doctrines of Christ, even to the consummation of the world.

I will now resume the exposition of the 6th chap. of St. John. At the 59th verse it is said,—

“ These things said he in the Synagogue, as he taught in Capernaum.”  
v. 60. “ Many therefore of his disciples, when they had heard this said, This is a hard saying, who can hear it.”

Let us again pause here. We have before us a melancholy example, indeed, of the weakness, pride, and obstinacy of human judgments; also of the danger of incredulity, which far from yielding to the repeated declaration of Christ, become more and more hardened, spreads around, and is not confined to the ignorant portion only of Christ's hearers, but finds its way amongst his disciples also. But this very infidelity of the disciples is of utility to us, as was subsequently the incredulity of Didymus; for Christ was ever ready to expound to his disciples, when requested by them, the meaning of his words, which sometimes he left in their obscurity to the multitude of his hearers. Does Christ then remove, so far as regards his disciples at least, the persuasion which his language had created in their minds, corresponding with that produced in the minds of the Capernaïtes, of a real, and *substantial*, not a symbolical manducation, and by faith only? No; we find on the contrary that he confirms it. Read the 61st and 62nd verses,—

“ When Jesus knew in himself that his disciples murmured at it, he said unto them doth this offend you? What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?”

Thus, instead of removing their difficulty, he tells them that it shall be greatly increased. Now this is not the case if the Protestant interpretation of the sacred text be admitted; for it was not more difficult to understand how Christ was to be received spiritually by a mere memorial, and how his flesh was to be eaten by faith in him, *after* his ascension into heaven, than when on earth. Faith easily ascends to the throne of the Almighty, quite as easily as it regards the object nearest to it. But by the Catholic interpretation the difficulty is really, and conformably with the declaration of Christ, increased; indeed we find amongst

the objections urged against the Catholic belief in the real presence one that is raised from this very difficulty of conceiving Christ present on our altars, now that he has ascended up to where he was before at the right hand of his Father. Moreover, by those words, Christ removes the false notion of the Capernaïtes and his disciples, as *to the manner* in which they were to partake of his flesh ; for they understood it, according to the apprehension of natural reason, of the eating of his flesh after a gross, carnal, and bloody manner ; but by those words :—

“ What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before,” he says sufficient to remove from their minds that degrading and erroneous notion.

We will now proceed to the 63rd verse,—

“ It is the spirit that quickeneth ; the flesh profiteth nothing ; the words that I speak unto you they are spirit, and they are life.”

You probably imagine, my Protestant Friends, that these words are the key to all which Christ has hitherto spoken ; that they clearly recal us from a literal, to a spiritual and figurative sense. Such is the interpretation which your divines put upon this passage. To me, I must acknowledge, they do not convey any such meaning. In the first place, the language of the foregoing verses is too perspicuous in my judgment, to be explained away by a passage which is not very clear ; nay, much less so than those upon which I ground my faith. Secondly, had Christ intended these words to serve as a key to the preceding part of his discourse, is it at all conceivable that the Capernaïtes and his disciples would not have understood them in that sense ?—that they, who by paying attention to his general manner, to the tone of his voice, to his looks, his gesture, &c. had advantages as *hearers* beyond what we have in merely *reading* his words, would have persisted in their mistake, had he thereby meant to recal them, as Protestants suppose, to the idea of a spiritual and figurative manner of eating ? Would they not have returned to him and acknowledged their error in too hastily forsaking him ? Would they not have cast themselves at his feet and said : —“ We have sinned, O Lord, in disputing thy words, which thou hast vouchsafed to render thus intelligible to our understanding ?” Did they do any thing of this kind ?

If we read on, we shall find such was not the case. I will first, however, lay before you the Catholic interpretation of this passage. By “ the Spirit that quickeneth,” we

understand *divine grace* ; the “ *flesh* ” that “ profiteth nothing ” is *the corporal senses, the carnal corrupt reason* of man. We find these terms employed in that meaning in several places of Scripture, as in Rom. chap. viii. 1.

“ There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the *flesh* but after the *spirit*.”

In Matt. chap. xvi. ver. 17. we find the term *flesh*, similarly applied :—

“ And Jesus answered and said unto him : Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jonas, for *flesh* and blood hath not revealed this unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.”

We are therefore warranted by Scripture in understanding in a like sense the words of the 63rd verse in the 6th chapter of John, which so understood are in accordance with the language of Christ, throughout all this discourse.

Proceeding to the 64th verse we read :—

“ But there are some o’ you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who it was that should betray him.”

The incredulity of his disciples is here censured by Christ. He reproaches some of them that “ they believed not.” Now what was it which they refused to believe ? It was, like the Capernaïtes, that Christ would give his flesh and blood, after a true and substantial manner, for their manducation ;—not a doctrine so little repulsive to reason as that he would give himself after a figurative and spiritual manner. But would Christ have thus condemned them for unbelief, were not the opposite doctrine to be truly received by them and us, as an article of revelation. In verse 65, our blessed Saviour thus continues his discourse :—

“ Therefore I said unto you, that no man can come unto me except it were given unto him of my Father.”

Here again he declares that *great grace is necessary* to understand his words in their true meaning. Now, according to the Protestant explanation, I cannot see how any such great grace is required. For, what is more easy than understanding them of a spiritual and figurative manducation ? What is more usual than for a man, when he is going to absent himself from his friends, to leave with them a token of his former intimacy ? But to believe the Catholic Doctrine great grace is necessary ; for though it is not *contrary* to, it is *above* the comprehension of human reason.

In the 66th verse it is related —

“ From that time many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him. Then said Jesus unto the twelve, Will ye also go away ?”

If the words of Christ were understood by the Apostles figuratively, it was now at least the time for them plainly to declare it. Yet, on what did they ground their adherence to Christ? Let us hearken to Peter who answered for the rest :—

“ Lord, to whom shall we go ? Thou hast the words of eternal life.”

Upon this he builds his faith : not because he understood what was proposed to his belief ; not because the words of Christ suggested nothing more than a figurative and spiritual manducation ; but, as if they far exceeded the comprehension of human reason, he believes *because Christ had spoken* :—

“ Lord, to whom shall we go ? Thou hast the words of eternal life.”

THE REV. E. TOTTENHAM.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I rise to take part in the discussion of this subject under the most painful and agitated feelings. Indeed, Sir, such has been the difficulty of my case, that, did I suppose it at all possible, I would have sought for the postponement of the discussion ; but, upon considering the subject, I could not justify myself in seeking the gratification of my own private feelings at the expense of the public convenience.

But, Sir, when I look around this assembly, and think of one who took a deep and intense interest in the investigation of this subject—when I call to mind a valued individual who has acted to myself with almost more than a mother’s kindness, and recollect that she, though present during two days of this discussion, lies now with the silent dead—under such circumstances, Sir, you will admit with me that I am but little competent, physically speaking, to engage in the work which is before me. I shall not, however, dwell upon my own feelings. I shall only press the matter upon our friends here present in the way of solemn warning. My dear friends, the individual to whom I refer, came here in the full enjoyment of health and strength ; she was the very life of the circle in which she moved ; but how soon has she been called from this



earthly scene! Oh! then, let this solemn event be deeply impressed upon all your minds, and may it lead you to remember that the subjects under discussion are of vital and eternal importance.

Sir, you will excuse me, and I am sure the meeting will, for these few remarks; and I now proceed to notice, as well as I may be able, and looking for the Divine assistance, the observations which have been made upon the subject on the other side of the question.

I cannot but admire the degree of tact (if I may so speak) which the Rev. Gentleman manifested at the commencement of his speech. You will remember that he threw out an assertion *ad captandum*, namely, that this and other doctrines, were known and held by the whole Church *before Protestantism had its existence*. Now, Sir, some individuals may be under a mistake on this subject, as there is an implication of the novelty or lateness of Protestant principles, in such observations. I must remark, therefore, in explanation, that the *name* of Protestantism has been late in its origin, but not the *principles* of Protestantism; and I might as well argue against Christianity itself, because the disciples were not for a considerable period *called Christians*, (namely, 'till they were so called in Antioch, as we read in the 11th chapter of the Acts) as argue against Protestant *principles* simply because *the name* Protestant did not exist 'till a late period. I am prepared to shew, if necessary, *that the essential principles of Protestantism have their foundation in the oracles of God*; and if I can prove *that*, then Protestantism is the old religion, and not the novelty which it is often characterised as being.

Mr. Brown stated very justly that it was necessary for him, before proceeding to the investigation of the Sacrifice of the Mass, to establish the doctrine of the *real presence*. Yes, Sir, this was necessary; and it is necessary for him, moreover, *to go a step farther*, and not merely to establish simply the doctrine of the real presence, but likewise the doctrine of the real *bodily* presence. I may as well state at the outset of my remarks, in order to avoid subsequent difficulty, that we do not quarrel with the doctrine of the real presence, provided it be a real *spiritual* presence *with the faithful*, such as the Church of England recognizes in her communion service, when she says—"For *then* (that is, *when 'with a true penitent heart and lively faith* we receive that holy Sacrament') we *spiritually* eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood"—but in order to establish the

doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass, as maintained by the Church of Rome, Mr. Brown must establish not merely *this*, but also as I have just said, the doctrine of the real *bodily* presence.

We have been presented with a statement of the doctrine of the Church of Rome upon the subject of Transubstantiation. The Rev. Gentleman has referred us to the 13th Session of the Council of Trent, and to a book called “The Principles of the Roman Catholic Religion;” and he has taken pains to impress upon us the fact, that Christ is not present in a *natural*, but in a *sacramental* body. I am not going to quarrel with this statement of the doctrine, so far as it goes; but I may be permitted, for the *clearer* exposition of it, to introduce a quotation of essential consequence derived from an authority which my Rev. opponent will not dispute. I hold in my hand the Catechism of the Council of Trent in the original language, and from it I read the following extract:—

“Now in this place it is to be explained by the pastors, that in this Sacrament are contained not only the true body of Christ, and *all the constituents of a true body*, such as THE BONES AND NERVES, but also Christ whole and entire. It is right to teach that the name of Christ is that of the God-Man, that is to say, of one person, in whom the Divine and human natures are united; that the Holy Eucharist, therefore, *contains both substances, and whatever is included in the idea of both*, the Divinity and humanity, whole and entire, the soul, the body and blood of Christ, *with all their component parts*, all of which faith teaches us, are contained in the Sacrament.”—Cat. Concil. Trid. Pars 2. de Euchar. Sac.

These are strong expressions, and for this reason I have quoted the passage. The Catechism of the Council of Trent, (the authority of which no Roman Catholic can dispute,) when defining the kind of body with which Christ is present in the Sacrament, uses, you observe, the terms BONES AND NERVES—“*velut ossa et nervos*”—and it is a remarkable fact that, inasmuch as this sounds rather harsh in our ears at the present day, the Rev. Mr. Donovan, Professor of Rhetoric at Maynooth College, in his translation, *has omitted this strong expression of the original*. So far by way of more enlarged explanation of the doctrine in debate, derived from Roman Catholic documents.

Now, Sir, my Rev. opponent said, that the proofs of the Roman Catholic doctrine upon this point appeared to be very strong from Scripture; and although, he says, they might be illustrated by an appeal to the church in the first ages, yet he thinks the testimony of Scripture quite sufficient. Accordingly, he proceeds to argue from

the written word. I rejoice that this disposition is manifested on the other side; and if we agree to settle this point, as well as all other doctrines, by an appeal to the "ORACLES OF GOD," I think we shall come to a more speedy termination of the controversy than we otherwise should.

I shall not, until a subsequent address, notice the *definitions* which have been given respecting the Sacrifice of the Mass, as my adversary has confined himself in his first speech to the discussion of TRANSUBSTANTIATION: but shall proceed at once to examine the argument which he has adduced on this latter subject from the 6th chap. of John; and this is the *only* one I have at present to attend to. Mr. Brown made some very lengthy observations upon this chapter. I shall, FIRST, refer to those observations; SECONDLY, I shall give you my reasons for supposing that this passage of Scripture is not to be taken in a literal, but in a *figurative* or *spiritual* manner; and, THIRDLY, I shall advance some *general* arguments against Transubstantiation.

The Rev. Gentleman declares (here was an argument *ad captandum*) that this passage *has been expounded in all ages of the Church as he then expounded it*, and that it was only in latter times that such an interpretation was contested! In reply to this sweeping assertion, I beg to state that an individual, whose name stands high in the Church of Rome, I mean Cardinal Bellarmine, when writing on the Eucharist, admits that there were several Roman Catholic doctors who, so far from being among those in all ages who have explained the chapter as it was explained this day, have *actually given it up, as not at all applicable to the doctrine of Transubstantiation*, and have sought a proof of that doctrine either from other parts of Scripture, or from the authority of the Church. And, moreover, did I not wish to keep as much as possible to the testimony of God's word alone, *I could produce extracts from writers in every age of the Church, giving a very different interpretation from that which Mr. B. has advanced*. I have before my mind at this moment a most striking comment of St. Augustine on this very portion of Scripture.

It was asserted also, that the Lutherans agreed with Roman Catholics in their interpretation of this chapter. Now, to whatever extent there may be agreement, there certainly is yet a manifest disagreement, unless indeed it can be proved that Consubstantiation is the same as Transubstantiation.

It is probable, said Mr. B. (after a long introduction)

that the Capernaïtes and the disciples would have understood our Lord on this point, better and more correctly than we can do. This, however, is not at all so probable; and if Mr. Brown will investigate the manner and conduct of the multitude and of the disciples, with reference to Christ's preaching generally, I think he will agree with me; for we positively know that *they constantly misunderstood Christ*, and gave a wrong interpretation of the views and principles he laid down. In the course of the three days discussion on the rule of faith, you will recollect that several times the ignorance of the disciples with respect to Christ's resurrection was brought forward, and we saw that that ignorance was most palpable, although he had previously spoken to them at various times upon the subject. It does *not* follow, therefore, that the multitude and the disciples were more likely to understand the conversation of our Lord in this chapter better than we could at the present day.

My opponent dwelt very much upon the view which the Capernaïtes and others took of Christ's words, and he put a case as follows:—"Suppose, said he, an organ of the Reformation Society were addressing an ignorant multitude in such terms as those used in the 6th of John, and they were scandalized, as were the Capernaïtes on this occasion, would not the individual correct their mistake, and explain the difficulty arising from the manner of his expression, if he intended they should understand him figuratively, and not literally." Therefore, he says, it is natural to suppose that, if Christ meant his words to be understood figuratively, *he would have told them so*. Whether he *did* make such an intimation or not, we shall presently see; but to Mr. Brown's case it may be sufficient to reply, that all analogies drawn from the conduct of finite man, must necessarily be imperfect, and too often savour of presumption. We have no right to pry into what Christ *ought* to have done, but it is our business to take the simple fact and bow in submission to what he *has* done.

The 64th verse of the chapter has been commented on, as one which is advanced by Protestants generally, to show the spiritual and figurative meaning of our Lord's words:

"It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing. *The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life.*"

Mr. Brown has attempted to explain away this passage, but it is a remarkable thing that, while he endeavoured to explain the terms "the spirit" and "the flesh" (as con-

trasted with each other) in the commencement of the verse, *he never once noticed the concluding part of the verse*, which seems to be still more expressive and decided. In this concluding part *the very words that Christ had used in the course of the chapter were referred to*, and Christ says, not merely "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing," but also, "*The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life.*" Here we have *our Lord's own comment upon his former expressions*, shewing that it was in a *spiritual and figurative* sense that he meant his words to be understood.

Reference has also been made to the 65th verse:—

"But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that did not believe, and who he was that would betray him."

Upon this Mr. Brown asks, "What was it which they refused to believe?" and he answers, "that Christ would give his flesh and blood, after a true and substantial manner, for their manducation." I wish Mr. B. had investigated the circumstances detailed in the chapter more particularly, and perhaps he would not have hazarded the assertion that it was for unbelief *of such a dogma as this* that he censured them. My view is, that he reproved them *generally for unbelief in him*, and if he had any particular reference, it was to the case of Judas Iscariot. If my opponent will examine the statements of the chapter he will find this to be the case:—

"There are some of you (says Christ) that *believe not*. For he knew from the beginning who they were that did not believe, and *who he was that would betray him.*"

Then he closes the chapter, after Peter's confession of faith, *not in such a doctrine as Roman Catholics would maintain, but in his own person and mission*—"We believe and have known that THOU ART THE CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD;"—he closes the chapter, I say, by declaring—

"Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil? Now *he meant Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon*; for this same was about to betray him, whereas he was one of the twelve."

SECONDLY, I shall proceed *to give some reasons* (additional to any that may have been *anticipated* by me) *why I am led to suppose that this chapter is not to be taken in the literal signification for which Mr. B. contends, and therefore does not support the doctrine of Transubstantiation as held by the Church of Rome.*

I. I beg to observe, that *it does not appear positively*

*that Christ here alludes to the sacrament at all.* He was urging the necessity of what he spoke of on his hearers *at that very moment*, and we know at that very moment *the sacrament was not instituted*. If his words involved a duty which it was requisite for them to perform at that very time, they could not have referred to the sacrament, which was not at that time instituted. At all events *it rests with our opponents to prove that he alluded to the sacrament*. Until they prove *that distinctly*, they derive no argument from the words of Christ contained in this chapter. The Roman Catholic Doctors, of whom I have just now spoken, as mentioned by Bellarmine, *admit* that it does not refer so precisely to the sacrament.

II. Another reason which I would advance for supposing that this chapter is not to be taken in a strictly literal sense is, that when Christ says, “Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and *drink his blood*, you shall not have life in you,” if he spoke of his literal body and blood, and the necessity of receiving each, he would be then *enjoining a practice which was decidedly contrary to the Mosaic law*. In the Mosaic law *abstinence from blood* was urged upon the people in the strongest terms, and, be it remembered, that this was a precept which was *retained and enforced in the Christian dispensation also*, according to the testimony of Mr. Brown himself in last week’s discussion. Now we read in the Gospel that Christ came “*not to destroy the law but to fulfil it* ;” and therefore we cannot suppose that he would have inculcated a duty upon the people which (especially while the law was still in force) would have destroyed and not fulfilled an express precept of that law.

III. If you take the words of the chapter in the *literal* acceptation which Mr. Brown would attach to them, *they would prove far more than my Rev. opponent is willing to admit* ; and that in *two ways*. First of all take the 54th verse :—

“Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you.”

Now, if this is to be taken in the *strictly literal* sense that Mr. Brown contends for, then what is the consequence ? It follows that—no matter how Christian soever a man’s character may be—no matter how scriptural soever a man’s faith may be—*except he literally eats the flesh of Christ and drinks his blood, he shall not have life in him !* So that, according to this *literal* interpretation,



the obtaining of eternal life depends upon the simple fact of receiving the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. The literal interpretation, however, proves too much in another way, as we find from the 55th verse : —

“ He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life.”

If we take this, too, in the *strictly literal* interpretation which our opponents would attach to it, it would follow that, though a man's character be never so bad—though his profession be hollow, and his faith unsound—yet *if he eats the flesh of Christ, and drinks his blood, he has everlasting life!* This must be the conclusion, according to the Roman Catholic view of the passage, for the divine testimony is such *without any qualification*. If, therefore, our friends on the other side will insist on the *literal* signification of these terms, I ask them to be consistent with themselves, and to admit that their interpretation, *if carried out to the full length, will prove far beyond what Scripture warrants*, and that, in the two ways I have mentioned.

IV. There is another point (and this is taking the Roman Catholic upon his own principles) which I desire to press upon our Roman Catholic friends present. We may talk, before the discussion is over, of what is called “ Communion in one kind.” Well, then, I ask you to look at the 54th and 55th verses of this chapter in reference to this point. If you take them in a *strictly literal* sense, and if, according to that interpretation, it is *absolutely necessary*, in order to everlasting salvation, that Christ's *blood* should be taken as well as his flesh, then what is the consequence upon your own principles? The consequence is, that *none of the laity can be saved, because none of the laity receive the cup*. You will tell me of the argument called *concomitancy*; that he who receives the body receives necessarily the blood with it. But I say this excuse is of no avail, for there is *no drinking* of the blood according to such a plan. It is a subterfuge to get out of the difficulty connected with this passage, for I maintain that it is essential (according to the literal interpretation of it, for which you contend) to *drink the blood*, as well as to *eat the flesh*: and therefore, upon your own principles (not upon my arbitrary conclusion), the laity cannot be saved, because *they do not drink the blood, as well as eat the flesh*. You see to what lengths your literal interpretation will carry you!



V. But, if these be some of the reasons why there is a difficulty in interpreting this portion of Scripture *literally*, I may be asked, *what is the real meaning of it?* and to this I shall now direct your attention. I take the expressions, “eating the flesh” and “drinking the blood” of Christ, simply to denote the act of *believing upon him*. I find that Christ, in all his discourses, uses a variety of expressions and figures similar to this, whereby he accommodates the matter to our finite understanding, and explains to us more fully *what faith means*. For example, he expresses faith by the act of *coming*:—“Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden.” Faith is expressed in the Old Testament by the act of *looking*:—“Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth.” Many similar instances might be given. In this manner the act of *eating* and *drinking*, of thus *feeding*, as it were, upon Christ, is also a figure, constantly used in the Bible, simply to denote the act of *believing upon him*.

Now, if you refer to the 34th and 35th verses of the chapter, this will appear in rather a striking manner. We read—

“They said therefore unto him: Lord, give us always this bread. And Jesus said unto them: *I am the bread of life*; he that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst.”

This verse seems to be a *key* to what is meant by the terms *eating* and *drinking*; that it is *not a literal* eating of the body or drinking of the blood of Christ that is intended, but that these expressions are used to denote the act of *believing and reposing upon him for our everlasting salvation*. And moreover, although Mr. Brown may dispute the application of the 64th verse (to recur again to what has been already noticed), I think it gives *another striking key* to the meaning of our Lord’s previous observations, when he says himself, at the close of them, “*The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life.*”

For these reasons, amongst others, I am led to imagine (and the meeting will judge whether the reasons are stronger or weaker than those mentioned on the other side) that this chapter is *not* to be taken in a *strictly literal* sense, but in a *figurative and spiritual one*: and that the expressions we have been considering denote *the believing upon Christ*, and not literally and actually the receiving of his body and his blood. Mr. Brown has as yet adduced no farther proof than this chapter, and I feel therefore at

this moment rather at a loss how to proceed. I did calculate that, in the course of an hour's speech, we should have more portions of sacred writ referred to, in the reply to which I might have occupied the time allotted me. However, as such has *not* been the case, I shall now betake myself

THIRDLY—to some general arguments which, I conceive, make against the fact of the bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

I refer first of all, to the 26th chapter of St. Matthew, which contains the words of the institution, and I shall read the whole of the passage. I shall not at present investigate the precise terms upon which our friends on the other side will dwell, leaving my observations on these points till they are adduced *in order*: but I shall merely call your attention to one feature in the passage, which I think militates against the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Commencing at the 26th verse, the Evangelist writes:—

“ And whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke : and gave to his disciples, and said : Take ye, and eat, this is my body. And taking the chalice he gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of this. For this is my blood of the New Testament which shall be shed for many for the remission of sins. And I say to you, I will not drink from henceforth of *this fruit of the vine* until that day when I shall drink it with you new in the kingdom of my Father.”

Here our Lord had used what are called the words of consecration—he had pronounced over the elements of bread and wine the words “ This is my body—This is my blood.” Therefore, on Roman Catholic principles, *the physical change should have taken place*, and the bread and wine should have been *transubstantiated into Christ's body and blood*. But how do we find our Lord expressing himself *after these words were uttered*? He does not seem to intimate any *physical* change in the wine, for, after all the other expressions, he adds in the 29th verse:—

“ I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of *this fruit of the vine* until that day when I shall drink it with you new in the kingdom of my Father.”

You perceive our Lord calls it the *fruit of the vine* even *after* the words of consecration had been used, and when, upon Roman Catholic principles, transubstantiation should have taken place.

A similar line of argument is suggested by the 11th chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, where the Apostle Paul also gives an account of the institution of the sacrament. In the 23rd verse he begins thus:—

“ I have received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and giving thanks, broke and said : Take ye and eat, this is my body which shall

be delivered for you ; this do for the commemoration of me. In like manner also the chalice, after he had supped, saying : This chalice is the New Testament in my blood : this do ye, as oft as you shall drink, for the commemoration of me. For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall shew the death of the Lord, until he come. Therefore whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself : and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of the chalice."

Now, Sir, let us ask here, did the Apostle suppose that, after the utterance of the words of consecration, there should take place a change of the *substance* of the bread and wine into the *substance of our Lord's body and blood* ; No such thing : for, after he had supposed the recital of those words, we find him no less than *three times speaking of the elements as if they had undergone no physical change* :—

"As often as ye shall eat *this bread*, and drink the chalice, &c.—Therefore whosoever shall eat *this bread*, or drink the chalice, &c.—But let a man prove himself ; and so let him eat of *that bread*, and drink of the chalice."—Verses 26, 27, 28.

Thus we have our Lord's comment in the 26th chapter of Matthew, and the Apostle Paul's comment in the 11th chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, and we find each calling the elements *bread and wine even after consecration*. These two considerations seem to furnish evidence that neither our Lord nor his Apostle could have recognized anything like the Transubstantiation which is held by the Church of Rome.

In connection with this, I may observe that there is another remarkable expression both in the words of the institution, as recorded by Luke, and also in the account given by St. Paul in the chapter just quoted. Our Lord says, when he gives the bread, in Luke xxii. 19 :—

"This is my body, which is given for you. Do this *for a commemoration of me.*"

The Apostle also, in speaking of the matter, says in the 24th and 25th verses of the 11th chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians :—

"And (Jesus) giving thanks, broke and said : Take ye and eat : this is my body which shall be delivered for you : this do *for the commemoration of me*. In like manner also the chalice, after he had supped, saying, This chalice is the new testament in my blood : this do ye, as often as ye shall drink, *for the commemoration of me.*"

I argue then that the simple fact of the expression *commemoration or remembrance* being used, seems to be proof of the *bodily absence* of Christ. It appears to convey the idea that, however he may be every where present in his Divinity (which we both are ready to admit), yet that at

the same time in a *bodily* sense he is *not* present; for how could a thing, properly speaking, be done *in remembrance of* an individual, if he were actually *present* at the time?

Another passage to which I shall advert is the 26th verse of the same 11th chap. of 1st Corinthians:—

“As often (says the Apostle) as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall shew the death of the Lord *until he come.*”

Mark the expression, “UNTIL HE COME.” I ask you, Sir, is it possible to conceive that the expression, “*until he come,*” would be used here by the inspired Apostle, *if Christ were actually present in a bodily sense at the time?* No, Sir, the very expression involves the idea of his *bodily absence*: and, if this be the case, the Apostle Paul was far from maintaining the doctrine of Transubstantiation held now by the Church of Rome.

Let me now bring you to the 3rd chap. of the Acts of the Apostles. You will recollect that, on a previous occasion, during the history of our Lord, he used the remarkable words:—

“The poor you have always with you: but *me you have not always.*”

John xii. 8.

Now the Apostle in this passage in the Acts, seems to be carrying out the same idea that was at that time expressed by our Lord himself; for, speaking of Christ, he says:—

“Whom Heaven indeed must receive until the times of the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of his holy Prophets from the beginning of the world.”—Verse 21.

Here it is distinctly asserted that *the heavens are to receive Christ until the times of the restitution of all things.* In *what sense* are they to receive him? The Apostle certainly alludes not to his Deity, for, in *that* point of view, he is *every where present*, both in heaven and earth. He refers evidently to *his human nature*; so that the passage affirms that his body is in the heavens, and that *they retain him, as to his body, till the restitution of all things.* Seeing that this is the fact, I am at a loss to conceive how the doctrine of Transubstantiation can be true.

Having thus adduced these few points much sooner, from the circumstances mentioned, than I had intended, I shall now cease, trusting that, in the next speech we have to make on this side of the question, we shall have *more matter to reply to* than at present. I trust that we shall come more to the marrow of the question. We are at present discussing the *comparatively* unimportant point

(though to a very great extent an important one) of the manner of Christ's presence in the Eucharist. I am anxious to get beyond this, into the question of greatest moment, the SACRIFICE OF THE MASS, and to shew the *evil consequences* that are made to result from the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Solicitous as I am to make this advance, I trust that proofs will be adduced as quickly as possible, in order that we may have occasion at once to reply without loss of time.

---

THE REV. F. EDGEWORTH.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Ladies and Gentlemen,—Many considerations present themselves to my mind, affording facilities where I apprehended, previous to the commencement of this discussion, difficulties in meeting the members of the Reformation Society. The Rev. Gentleman who has just addressed the meeting, has, on the present occasion, as he did at various times last week, repeated his determination, never to presume to say what God ought to do, but to content himself with learning with all humility what he has done. In that sentiment, which is entirely a Catholic sentiment, but which is faintly participated in by most of our Protestant brethren, in that sentiment, I most fully concur. It is a sentiment which, on account of its consequence, particularly distinguishes the Catholic Christian from his Protestant brethren. What is the imputation most frequently brought against us? It is easy to express it in one word: it is, that the Catholics believe to excess. Yes, Sir, the Catholics do believe all that God declares, though, in the revelations of the Supreme Being, there are, and we contend there must be, things which very far surpass the understanding of man. I, therefore, rejoice at Mr. Tottenham's frequent expression of his conviction, that it is his duty and my duty, and it is the duty of every Christian, with all humility, to receive the revelations of God, and not to deny the truth of the smallest part of them, on the ground that we cannot, with our present limited understandings, comprehend its import. But, Sir, I shall rejoice exceedingly if the Rev. Gentleman, besides making this sensible declaration of his disposition to submit his understanding to the revelation of God,—if he will allow that disposition to influence him through-

out the whole discussion. But I consider that he has departed from that which he has declared to be his duty: it seems to me that the laboured explanation which he has given of the 6th chap. of John is a departure from it, to be ascribed to no other motive (I do not wish to impute any sinful motive) than the natural desire, of which perhaps he is scarcely conscious, of not believing the declaration of Christ that he would give his "flesh" to eat, and his "blood" to drink, because the belief of such a doctrine is "hard" to his understanding: it was "hard" to the Jews.

I shall be glad to notice the various things to which that Rev. Gentleman diverted the attention of the meeting; one word in passing bestowed upon some of them will be sufficient to prevent their being again mentioned. He has introduced a mistranslation of the Catechism of the Council of Trent. We are not here to defend that particular translation to which he has alluded. I and every other Catholic must feel disappointed at any failure or departure in the translation from the original text; but perhaps it will satisfy Mr. Tottenham, if I at once tell him that we believe that we receive, in the Holy Eucharist, the body and blood of Christ *whole and entire*; therefore not excluding "*the bones and nerves*," and all the other circumstances which the gentleman has mentioned. We believe, my Christian friends, that Christ made a solemn promise that he would give his followers, not a manna from the clouds, such as fell down upon the Israelites in the desert, but some food of a different nature and superior efficacy. In explanation he declared that this food should be his own person. "*I am the living bread which came down from heaven.*" He over and over again pledged himself to give his "flesh" to be eaten, and his "blood" to be drunk.

In one thing there is perfect unison between us and the Rev. Gentleman opposite; on both sides we are convinced that these declarations are to be found in the Holy Scripture; we enjoy in common the happiness of knowing that these are the words of one who cannot deceive us—that they are the words of a God-Man, whose truth, whose power neither of us can question. I may remark that I am now proceeding upon an argument which I lament can be of little weight with Unitarian friends who are present; my business is with opponents who yet are united with me in firm belief in the divine and human natures of Jesus.

Christ. Mr. T. as well as myself fully depends upon the character of Jesus Christ: he knows that our Lord cannot deceive us, and that our Lord has power to fulfil his promises; and, therefore, that if Christ made any promise on this or any other occasion, that promise must be redeemed.

With this preparation of mind and heart, induced by our common faith, I now, Sir, most confidently return to the consideration of the 6th chapter of St. John's Gospel; and to it I entreat the attention of our Protestant friends, to some the subject may be novel, but to all, I trust, it appears most important. For our respective creeds on this subject involve practical consequences, which I cannot conceal from myself for a moment to be other than such as affect our prospect of salvation. In recalling your attention to the 6th chapter of John, it is not necessary that I should read at length the texts which have been already quoted, they are probably in the memory of every one present; but I will offer a few explanatory remarks. The Jews asked our blessed Redeemer what sign he had to "*shew, that they might see and believe in him.*" Now he had just wrought a splendid miracle; he had just multiplied five loaves and two fishes into sufficient sustenance for 5000 persons. Yet, from a desire perhaps to see a greater miracle, though many of them were induced to follow him on this occasion by a still less defensible desire of receiving corporeal food, they demanded some sign or miracle that should warrant their faith in him; and, as if it occurred to them, as it must occur to our minds, that this was not a respectful or reasonable petition, inasmuch as he had just before shewn a sign—performed a splendid miracle—they, in defence of their curiosity or incredulity, contrasted the miracle which they had just witnessed, with the miracle wrought in favour of their forefathers in the desert. "*Our fathers,*" they said, "*did eat manna in the desert;*" signifying that the manna from the clouds was as great a sign as the feeding of 5000 with a few loaves; they looked for a greater sign before they would become his disciples. Our Saviour then, in reply to this demand, promises to give them something more precious than the manna; he promises to work a greater miracle; and it appears to me impossible for the Rev. Gentleman opposite, with his creed respecting the nature of the Eucharist (for I believe he will admit that ancient term), it is utterly impossible for him to shew that



a more striking or splendid miracle was wrought by Jesus Christ in favour of his followers, or a more precious food given to them than the manna which fed the Israelites in the desert. But how natural and intelligible is the whole passage with our belief of the nature of the holy Eucharist? You have, perhaps, been accustomed, Sir, to regard your Catholic brethren with pity, because they believe that the bread can be changed into the body of Christ and the wine into his blood. But, for a moment, figure to yourselves that our faith is correct; suppose you were assured by a voice from heaven, (though that could not be to my mind more clear than the voice of Jesus Christ speaking from the Gospel of St. John)—but suppose you were thus assured that our opponents are in error, and that the Catholic Church is correct, when she teaches that the bread and wine are by divine power changed into the body and blood of Christ; suppose for a moment that this is the true doctrine, I ask you, my Protestant friends, if you could not at once explain the argument which our Saviour uses to the unbelieving Jews? Do you not, on the assumption that our faith is the correct faith, behold a strength and clearness in the argument of our Saviour which you did not discover before? Is there not, as we regard the Eucharist, something infinitely more precious and splendid than the manna which fell from the clouds to feed the ancient people of God? That was called the food of angels: but this bread which Christ prepares for his followers is termed “*the bread of God*” (ver. 33); and he explains to the Jews, in part, in what way this bread which he would prepare for his followers, should excel the bread which was given to the Israelites in the desert. “*I am that bread of life*” (ver. 48). Is not this readily understood by those who believe as the Catholic Church believes? We believe that Christ is really present in the eucharistic food; that he is, as he declares (ver. 51), that “*living bread which came down from heaven*,” and which is given from Christian altars.

Jesus proceeds then to promise to those who shall eat of this bread, that they shall live for ever: and he adds; “*the bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world.*”

Now here, I entreat my Protestant friends to endeavour to divest themselves of previous feelings,—I will not term them prejudices, unwilling to give offence;—but, if all present will endeavour to divest themselves of all previous

impressions, and to come, as if this were the first time, to the examination of this subject, what will be their interpretation of the words of our Redeemer? Christ says, that he will give something more precious to his followers than the manna which the Israelites received in the desert; he says he will give them *bread from heaven*. I believe, our friends opposite would give their disciples only bread from the *earth*. Our Saviour proceeds and says, "*I am the bread*;" and we, my friends, we Catholics believe that *he is the bread*; and we give that bread from our altars which he declares himself to be. Then he says, "*the bread which I will give is my flesh for the world*." Our friends on the opposite side say, "It is *not* his flesh."

The Jews said, "How can this be done? *How can this man give us his flesh to eat?*" They had witnessed his many splendid miracles; yet this promise which he now made of giving them food, which should be his own person, appeared to them something far more stupendous than any of his works which they had yet seen. But mark how he repeats the declaration, when refusing to receive this doctrine, they said:—

"How can he give us his flesh to eat? And he—Amen, Amen—I say unto you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you."—(v. 54.)

"My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed."—(v. 56.)

"He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him."—(v. 57.)

Now, my Christian friends, let me again call your attention to that interpretation which the Catholic reader necessarily puts upon this passage,—an interpretation which, I am persuaded, will appear to many of my Protestant friends, at least as natural as any other, although it includes the subjection of our understanding to the revealed wisdom of God.

Our Saviour, in declaring that "*unless we eat his flesh and drink his blood we have no life in us*," challenges our attention to two points,—belief and practice. He declares that his flesh and his blood are provided for our food by him; and he declares that, unless we partake of that food, we shall not have life. Now, our friends, our Protestant brethren, who have not been acquainted with this truth, as it has always been expounded by the Catholic Church, in the first place, do not believe the words of Christ; they may not be conscious of their disbelief, but they do not in fact believe that in the Eucharist, or in any

other way, they receive the flesh and blood of Christ, or *that his flesh is truly meat, and his blood truly drink*. In consequence of not believing this doctrine, they take no care to find out those persons who have been ordained to succeed the apostles, to perpetuate this spiritual food which Christ has provided for his followers. The unhappy results of their error, on this point, are twofold. In the first place, they do not believe the words of Christ; and they who refuse to believe him are in danger of a judgment, which I am sure it is my earnest desire and constant prayer that every one who now listens to me may escape. Secondly, they do not feed their souls with the body and blood of Christ: and yet such nourishment for our souls Christ has pronounced to be essential to our everlasting welfare.

Again then, my Christian friends, I confidently, nay, earnestly entreat you, to give your minds to the study of this 6th chapter of the Gospel of St. John, not only here, but when you have left this place, when you are in your own houses, in solitude preparing yourselves by prayer, and looking to the Almighty to give you grace, that all ignorance may be chased away, and that you may discover the truth, whether it is to be found in the doctrine of our friends opposite, or in the doctrine of the Catholic Church. I entreat you to ponder well the words you find in the 6th chapter of St. John. I am convinced that if not all, (I speak from much experience had with my Protestant brethren,) I am convinced that, at least, many of you will say in your hearts, "If Christ is God, I will not dare to dispute the truth of his declarations. Nor will I put limits to his power. And as Christ is God, then, when he tells me that he will give me '*his flesh to eat and his blood to drink*,' I must feel convinced he *has* provided such a banquet for my soul. Where shall I find it?" Christian friends, I will tell you where to find it,—in the Catholic Church; our Reverend opponents will acknowledge that you will not find it in the Church established by law in this country.

It is of much more importance than the Reverend Gentleman opposite seemed to be aware, that we should establish the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist. He is very anxious that we should go hastily to the second branch of the subject, the Sacrifice of the Mass; but you will recollect, you are all aware, that there are other two days yet before us, during which,

with the blessing of God, we shall have full time to proceed with that discussion. But I feel, perhaps, more strongly than he does the importance of our previously discussing thoroughly the doctrine of the real presence of Christ; for if Christ is not present on the altars of the Christian religion, in his “body and blood,” perhaps our time will not be well spent in discussing whether we ought or not to offer to the Supreme Being mere bread and wine.

It is our belief that Christ, who now sits at the right hand of his Father in the eternal kingdom of Heaven;—it is our belief, that this Divine Being, for the nourishment of our souls, shrouds his glory and conceals it under the appearance of bread and wine. It is our belief, that he first of all wrought this change of the bread and wine into his own sacred body at his last supper, there fulfilling the promise which he had previously made, as is recorded in the 6th chapter of St. John. It is our belief, that when he had done this, he commanded his apostles to do the same thing. The apostles did of course what he had commanded them to do, after his visible presence was withdrawn. They also took bread and wine, and pronounced the words which he had ordained; and the faith of the apostles, I maintain, we shall have ample time to ascertain. The faith of the apostles, and the faith of the early Christians, as can clearly be shewn by an appeal to such writings as are still extant, was, that when the words appointed by Jesus Christ, were uttered by the apostles, or by any, legitimately ordained, to succeed to, or be associated with them, in the ministry,—that when these appointed words were pronounced, then the bread and wine became changed in substance; the bread became the body of Christ, and the wine became his blood. That is the faith of Catholics; and although the Reverend Gentleman opposite has expounded the 6th chapter of St. John in a way at variance with our belief on this point—although he has laboured much to shew that the words of Christ, “*unless you eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man you cannot be saved*,” signify nothing contrary to his doctrine, which is, that *without* eating the flesh of our Lord, and *without* drinking his blood, we *may* be saved, (for remember *that* is the doctrine of the Reformation Society—that is the doctrine of the Church established by law in this country)—and although he has thus expounded the 6th chapter of St. John, I most confidently, as I said before, refer you, again and again, to the study

of these inspired words, assured that many of you will come from that study, saying: ‘far be it from me so to distort the Word of God, as to say that the *flesh* of the Son of Man signifies *bread*, and that the *blood* of the Son of Man signifies *wine*,—that the declaration of the Son of God, “unless you actually eat his *flesh* and drink his *blood*, ye shall have no life in you,” signifies no more than this, that “unless ye take real bread and real wine to represent my body and blood, ye shall not have life in you.”’ I am sure that scarcely any of you will come to that conclusion, and feel satisfied that he has fairly interpreted the Word of God.

It is in the recollection of the meeting, that the Rev. Gentleman opposite, several times last week, declared his belief, that if we had only the gospel of St. John and no other portion of the inspired writings, we should have sufficient to guide us to heaven; this was in support of his opinion, that the written word is a sufficient rule of faith. All that was necessary for him to know was contained, so he contended, in the gospel of St. John. Now he has told you to-day that he believes (but he said this with some degree of caution, which, perhaps, will be rendered more visible hereafter), that the 6th chapter of St. John does not refer at all to the rite instituted by our Saviour at the last supper. Well now, if the 6th chapter of St. John does not refer to the last supper, there is no other passage in that gospel which speaks of that solemn rite. Yet it is laid down in the Book of Common Prayer which the gentleman uses, and which he would wish me to use in conjunction with Scripture, to find out the way which leads to heaven, that, of the sacraments instituted by our Lord, the supper is one of those which are generally necessary for the salvation of men. Now, if it is generally necessary for the salvation of mankind, and if no mention of it is to be found in the gospel of St. John unless in the 6th chapter, which I solemnly aver does refer to that sacred rite, but which accordingly to the Rev. Gentleman does not, then I say, either that he cannot find all the knowledge necessary to salvation in the gospel according to St. John, or that its 6th chapter must be referred to the Lord's supper. I will not lay further stress on this, because I feel that Mr. T. has inadvertently committed himself, and on this or other points we ought not to involve his Protestant brethren in the same mistake.

He had offered various reasons for interpreting the

6th chapter of the gospel of St. John in a *figurative* sense. Now to these various reasons, I do not at present pay any attention, convinced of the overwhelming testimony which this gospel contains of the truth of Catholic doctrine; namely, that there is in the Eucharist, the real flesh and the real blood of Jesus Christ. I know well that it is more agreeable to the reason of man to explain away the mysteries of religion; but just as the gentleman opposite prefers expounding the 6th chap. of St. John in a figurative sense, affirming that it is the *mode* more agreeable to reason, so, our Unitarian brethren choose to expound those texts of sacred Scripture which refer to the divine nature of Christ, in a sense which would make him out to be a mere creature; and on the very same ground as Mr. T. has chosen, does the Unitarian do this, because he is prepared to tell us, that he cannot conceive how the Supreme Being could so far debase himself as to take on him our human nature. He cannot understand this; and certainly the charity that God here exhibits towards us, transcends our comprehension. But when the Rev. Gentleman opposite, as well as his Catholic brethren, bends his understanding to the belief of the incarnation of the Son of God—after that mystery, the greatest of all mysteries, he ought to find no difficulty in believing that Christ can be present under the appearance of bread and wine on the Christian altars; he ought to have no difficulty in believing this, if he can find any thing in Scripture that declares this to be the truth. Again I say, the gospel of St. John, the 6th chap. does declare this. We now proceed to the passage to which the Rev. Gentleman has asked your attention. Matt. xxvi. 26.

These are the words in which the Evangelist St. Matthew, c. xxvi. v. 26, describes the fulfilment of the promise made by Christ, as recorded in the 6th chap. of St. John.

*“And whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and brake it, and gave to his disciples, and said, Take ye and eat, this is my body.”*

I am speaking to those who believe the power and truth of Christ, to those who believe in his divinity. I ask, *could* he change bread into his body? You will at once answer Yes. I speak to those who believe in the inspiration of the sacred Volume, and it is here stated, that he took bread and declared it to be his body; did it become his body, or did it not? Again, I appeal to the faith you have in the character of Christ, as a divine being. To that question our friends opposite, and Protestants generally an-



swer, that it is *not* the body of Christ ; but to that question the Catholic world replies—*It is the body of Christ.*

Again in the next verse ; “ *And taking the chalice, he gave thanks ; and gave to them saying ; drink ye all of this.*” What was that which the chalice contained ?—“ *This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many unto the remission of sins.*” Did not Christ shed his real blood upon the cross for the sins of mankind ? Does he not here declare that the chalice which he tendered to the Apostles and bade them drink of, contained that blood which he was about to shed for the remission of the sins of the world ? Do not tell me this involves circumstances and things which we cannot comprehend, and therefore need not believe. That would be a fitter answer from persons who did not believe in the truth of Scripture, or did not believe in the divine character and power of our Saviour ; but such a reply I do not expect to be whispered by any one who regards the power of Christ as infinite, who regards Christ as God ; he tenders the chalice saying that we are to drink of it, for it contains the blood shed for the remission of the sins of the world. We who believe his character to be divine, must humble all our senses before his declaration : we must chase away whatever objections our reason or the prejudices of our education might furnish ; and say : ‘ as this declaration is made by the Son of God, I believe it ; I believe therefore he changed the bread into his body, and the wine into that blood which he shed for the remission of the sins of the world.’ St. Mark xiv. 22. narrates, in nearly the same language, the institution of the Holy Eucharist :—

“ *And as they did eat, Jesus took bread and blessed and brake it, and gave to them and said, take ye ; this is my body. And he took the cup ; and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them : and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, this is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many.*”

In St. Matthew it is added :—

“ I will not henceforth drink of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I shall drink it new with you in the kingdom of my Father.”

In the Gospel of St. Mark xiv. 25. we read :—

“ Verily I say unto you I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I shall drink it new in the kingdom of God.”

The Rev. Gentleman opposite has asked us, “ Is not this a proof even after the words of consecration as employed by our Catholic brethren, that our Saviour declares it still to be wine ?” No, my Christian friends. No : Christ has already told us this is his *blood* which should be shed for



the remission of the sins of the world. If he calls it now the fruit of the vine we see the reason for this figurative language : it being still such in appearance, still such to the eyes and to the taste, and to all the senses of man ; but if it is still only the fruit of the vine, and if the words of consecration effected no change in it, why did he call it his blood ? We give a reason why figurative language should be still employed, why, first, the sacred elements should still be called the bread of God, the bread of life, or simply bread ; why in continuance the consecrated contents of the chalice should be called wine ; they were still such to the senses of man, but that mere appearance loses its influence before the testimony of faith, before the testimony of the word of God. Our corporeal senses have been prostrated before the unerring words of the Son of God ; he has declared that the bread became his body and the wine his blood ; the person who receives that declaration with faith, as I trust that most of you do, has no difficulty afterwards when he finds these two same things which to the senses of man are still unchanged mentioned in terms such as the senses would suggest.

But I will proceed to the 1 Cor. chap. xi. I might first adduce most striking passages from the preceding chapter ; but other opportunities will present themselves ; having but little time left, I prefer drawing your attention to the 11th chapter beginning at the 23rd verse. If the Rev. Gentleman should give one interpretation of the words used by our Saviour in his last supper in instituting the Eucharist, and I or any other Catholic should give another interpretation, and if in consequence of these contradictions some of you should remain in doubt to which side you ought to be inclined, you would naturally feel anxious to see some other passage of sacred Scripture that might throw light on this the disputed matter. I most confidently challenge the gentlemen opposite and must invite the attention of all our friends present to the language of the inspired St. Paul as we find it here in 1 Cor. xi. 23 :—

*“ For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you.”*

He now recounts what he received in revelation from the Lord Jesus Christ :—

*“ That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed took bread : and giving thanks he brake it, and said, Take ye and eat ; this is my body which shall be delivered for you ; this do in commemoration of me.”*

St. Paul says it is the body of Christ ; Catholics hold

the same language ; most of our Protestant brethren say it is *not* the body, it is merely a *figure*.

“ After the same manner he also took the chalice when he had supped, saying, ‘ This chalice is the new testament in my blood : this do ye, as often as you shall drink, in commemoration of me.’ ”

The Catholic expounds these last words most naturally ; and I maintain that our friends opposite cannot reconcile them with their belief, without labouring, I think, unsuccessfully to satisfy you that they expound them according to the truth. Moreover, in what manner can mere bread and wine “ *shew the death of our Lord?* ” But on the other hand, when, according to the Catholic faith, under this appearance of bread and wine lie concealed the true body and blood of Christ, you see by faith the victim which our Saviour made himself, when he submitted to the ignominy and the pangs of death. In our perpetual commemoration of this rite according to his command, you see we are constantly “ *shewing forth,* ” according to our faith, “ *the Lord's death ;* ” and the Catholic Church will be marked throughout the world by having its altars daily honoured with the celebration of the rite instituted by our Saviour at the last supper. On the Catholic altars to the end of the world will be shewn forth the death of Jesus Christ, according to the command given to his ministers. Moreover,—

“ *Whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.* ”

According to Protestant belief, how is a man “ *guilty of the body and blood of the Lord,* ” who receives mere bread and wine, however unworthily ? According to the Catholic belief of Christ's body and blood being there, you may understand that *whosoever shall presume to partake of this divine food unworthily, shall be guilty of profaning the body and blood of Christ.*

But the Apostle continues :—

“ *Let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of the chalice.* ”

And accordingly, in the Catholic Church, the man who is conscious of sin feels repulsed from the altars of religion ; he feels it would be a crime to presume to partake of the holy Eucharist, containing, as he knows it does, the body and blood of Christ. He feels repulsed from this holy banquet, and let me tell you that our practice is invariably to instruct those who approach the table of the Lord, first to *prove* themselves ; and if they see any stains of sin in

their souls, to remove them by sorrow and penance, and having recourse to those who have succeeded the Apostles in the ministry, that they may exercise the power which is given to us in our ordination (which seems in some sort to have been given to the Rev. Gentleman opposite when he was ordained), namely, the power to forgive sins.—

“ Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them ; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.

Let it not be said this belongs not to the subject ; it may not seem to enter into the main portion of it, but I expound it to you to shew you how we understand and act upon the text last quoted from St. Paul.

“ For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord’s body.”

If the Lord’s body is not there, how can he ———  
[Time expired.]

REV. J. LYONS.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Ladies and Gentlemen,—On the last week of the Discussion the Rev. Mr. Brown complained sadly of the trying circumstances under which he was placed in disputing about the Rule of Faith. Now, I do think that he will labour under much more trying circumstances this week : being called upon to disprove an assertion which appears to us contrary to common sense. It would be as reasonable to ask a man to prove the assertion that a fish is not a horse, as to require of us to disprove the assertion, that what we see to be a piece of bread, and know to have been made in a baker’s shop, is actually “ the body, blood, soul, divinity, bones and nerves of the Lord Jesus Christ.”

Now all present must acknowledge that this is a great difficulty to meet. The Rev. Gentlemen have referred us to the 6th chapter of John, and have dwelt very largely and for a considerable length of time on it. As Mr. Tottenham has already commented on it, I shall only offer a few remarks in addition to what has been already spoken. Mr. Edgeworth when speaking upon it, called our attention to a very remarkable miracle that had been wrought by our Lord in the desert, and then he tells us that the Eucharist is a miracle. Let us draw the parallel

between the real and the asserted miracle—let us see whether there be any family features between them.

In the first place, when we turn to the miracle wrought in the desert, where above five thousand were fed with five barley loaves and two small fishes, we see that the loaves were made of barley which grew in the ground—sprung up and ripened—then it was brought to the mill and ground down, and then it was sent to the baker and made into barley loaves. In the Eucharist you might see a similar miracle to this, because the wheaten bread grows in the field, is brought to the baker and then it is made into paste or wafers; a part is transferred to a Roman Catholic chapel in the neighbourhood, and part is applied to the daily sustenance of the human body. So far we see the parallel between them—but let us go farther. The five barley loaves were presented to the people to eat, “they did all eat and were satisfied.” There was first the giving of thanks previous to eating. The people had more than sufficient of the bread to eat—so that twelve baskets full remained over and above, after the multitude had been satisfied. But now let us come to the miracle of transubstantiation. First of all, this wheaten bread, or cake, or wafer, is brought and laid on the altar; there are many words pronounced over it, some in a loud voice, some in a low tone, and others only whispered *secretè*, uttered as it were “secretly.” When these words are uttered there is *no visible change*; the wafer *remains the same* in its colour, in its form, in its taste—there is no *sensible* transubstantiation, and yet it is immediately held up before the people, and they are all called *to bow down and worship it*. But this was not the case in the miracle in the desert; the barley loaves were not held up as God to be worshipped, but in the case of transubstantiation the wafer is immediately said to be God.

In the miracle in the desert they ate and were filled, but in the asserted miracle of transubstantiation no sooner is the wafer deified, than in order to shew great affection for their God, they immediately devour him. It reminds me of the story of two sharks that were said to be so strongly attached to each other that when the female died, the male in order to shew his affection ate her up, lest some other shark should come and devour her. This is the case with regard to the consecration of the piece of bread. It is first made into a god, and then the people to shew their reverence to this god, first bow down and worship, and then eat him.

In the 32nd chapter of Exodus and the 20th verse, we are told that Moses—

“ Laying hold of the calf which they had made, he burnt it and beat it to powder, which he strowed into water, and gave thereof to the children of Israel to drink.”

This was the golden calf that Aaron had made at the time that Moses was upon the mount with the Lord God, and Moses, in order to shew *the contempt* he poured upon it, ordered it to be beat to pieces, to be ground into powder, and the people of Israel, to shew their abhorrence of it, were commanded to drink it ; here we have a parallel case with transubstantiation. The Roman Catholics are required, as soon as they have worshipped their god, to eat him. Moses shews us that whatsoever passes into man is contemptible, and therefore with regard to the Eucharist, to say that it contains in it the “ body, soul, blood, and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ” pours the most utter contempt on our Lord and Saviour.

But again it is asserted to be a mystery equal to the Trinity. A mystery is somewhat that does not contradict our senses. It may be *above* our understanding, but it is not *contrary* to it. I take the mystery of the Resurrection; in the 15th chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians the Apostle says, it is “ a mystery.” The Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ is in the 1st Epistle to Timothy 3rd chapter and 15th verse, called “ a mystery.” The union between Christ and his members—although it is translated in the Douay Bible a sacrament—yet it is “ a mystery.” Here are three mysteries of Scripture, the Resurrection of the Dead, the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, and the Union between Christ and his People, and there is nothing *contrary* to the senses, though there is much *above* the understanding: yet we are called upon by the express declaration of God to believe these things, and they are laid before us to exercise our faith. We may, as I have just now said, not *understand* them, but *they do not contradict* any of our senses. But let us look at the asserted mystery of transubstantiation. In the first place I shall ask by what compressive process (and we live in days of great invention)—could the “ body, and soul, and divinity, the head, the members, and the feet of the Lord Jesus” be compressed into the flatness of a thin wafer, and then be translated to that which we see standing there, [pointing to the altar.] I believe there are few of us that would like our bodies to be compressed in such a manner. Here is

the first difficulty that meets us in this asserted mystery—we do not find these difficulties, contradictory to our senses, in the case of the Incarnation, nor of the Trinity, nor yet in the Resurrection, nor in the Union of Christ with his People.

I will not dwell any longer on this point, but will call your attention to the 6th chapter of the Gospel of St. John, to the verses that Mr. Edgeworth alluded to therein. He first began with the 30th verse—

“What sign therefore dost thou show that we may see and may believe thee? What dost thou work? Our fathers did eat manna in the desert as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat. Then Jesus said to them: Amen, amen, I say to you, Moses gave you not bread from heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is that which cometh down from heaven and giveth life unto the world. They said, therefore, unto him: Lord, give us always this bread.”

The Jews were, as usual, seeking after a sign, and no sign would the Lord then give them, as he had oftentimes refused at other periods. But he now turns the conversation to a more profitable subject, he begins to advise them not “to labour” so assiduously “for the bread that perisheth,” and to forget the spiritual nourishment of their never-dying souls. While they were intent upon what they should eat, and what they should drink, they were altogether forgetful of the immortal spirit that should soon pass before the throne of the living God; and, therefore, Jesus again brought them back to the great question, for although he might work a miracle, yet the miracle would not of necessity work faith in their hearts, according to the testimony of Jesus, that if they “*did not believe Moses and the prophets, neither would they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.*” He accordingly continues to speak to them, and they say, “Give us always this bread.” How does Jesus then explain his words? “Jesus said, I am the bread of life, he that *cometh* to me shall not hunger, and he that *believeth* in me shall never thirst.” Thus he explains what he meant by “the bread of life:” it was that spiritual nourishment that he was to give, through faith, to all his own people. The conversation is then carried on further, and immediately he lays down the truth which was the *real* cause of offence to the Jews—a truth which has a severe anathema pronounced against it by the Church of Rome; and, therefore, it is not to be wondered at that it was not adverted to on the other side:—

“All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me, I will not cast out.”

The words which offended these people are recorded in the 65th and 66th verses—

“There are some of you that believe not, for Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that did not believe, and who he was that would betray him. And he said : Therefore did I say to you, that no man can come to me unless it be given him by my Father.”

Here was the true occasion of the disciples being offended: for it is instantly added “*After this* many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him.” For further proof of this I refer you to the 43rd and 44th verses—

“Jesus therefore answered and said to them : Murmur not among yourselves. No man can come to me except the Father who hath sent me draw him, and I will raise him up in the last day. It is written in the Prophets, And they shall all be taught of God.”

The *true* cause of offence was because Jesus *abased the pride of their hearts*, by shewing that in their own might or power they never could come to the living God—that all their own works done before the influence of the Spirit upon the soul were only vain and empty things that never could recommend them to the grace of the living God,—to the blessing of eternal salvation. But as such doctrine comes under a very heavy anathema in the decrees of the Council of Trent respecting justification, they were wisely passed over by the gentlemen on the other side, and the whole occasion of offence ascribed to the words, “eating the flesh” and “drinking the blood.”

In order to understand aright the meaning of the words “eating the flesh, and drinking the blood,” you must recollect that in Scripture it is usual to speak of the Christian, and say, that he is “born again”—that he “grows,” and “increases,” and “walks,” and “falls.” Now all these things are *spiritual*—he is spiritually “born again,” and he spiritually grows into the Lord Jesus Christ, he walks in the spirit, and he falls into sin. Here, then, we find all these words of common application to the *body* of man applied to the *soul*, and to the *spiritual state* of the Christian before God ; and therefore we say that the words “eating and drinking” are used in the same sense of accommodation *in order to shew the necessity of the close union that must subsist between the Lord Christ and all his members*. It only shews us that, while the Lord dwells “in our hearts by faith,” we become a part of his mystical body, and we live by him, and are strengthened by him. It is by the spiritual feeding of our souls on the Lord Jesus, *by faith*, that we become members of his body, in that spiritual union which shall never be dissolved. It shews, more-



over, that as the natural body must hunger and thirst after food when deprived of it for some time, even so must it be with the soul that has "tasted and seen that the Lord is gracious." There must be an "hungering and thirsting after righteousness"—a coming by faith to Jesus to receive, as the Apostle says, fresh "supplies of the Spirit of the Lord."

But again we can shew that even if this chapter did refer to the Sacrament, yet it could not mean the literal eating of the body and drinking of the blood of Christ, because, if it did, *it would contradict the old law*. Christ came into the world "to fulfil all righteousness." The sacrifices under the law were types and figures of Jesus, and none more so than the sin-offering. Now let us advert to the sin-offering referred to in the 6th chapter of Leviticus, and the last verse—

"For the victim that is slain for sin, the blood of which is carried into the tabernacle of the testimony to make atonement in the Sanctuary, SHALL NOT BE EATEN, but shall be burnt with fire."

The priest *was not allowed to eat of* this sin-offering. The Lord Jesus Christ was offered up for us, or as the Apostle Peter expresses it, "He died, the just for the unjust, that he might reconcile us to God." "He bare our sins in his own body on the tree." "He was made sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." According to *the law*, the sin-offering was *not* to be eaten, but, according to the new rule of *Romanism*, the sin-offering *is* to be eaten. Here, then, we find the law of the Church of Rome departing from the law of God. In the Book of the Law it is said "it shall *not* be eaten;" in the Book of Romanism, "it *shall* be eaten." I speak to wise men: judge ye which ye ought to obey, God or man.

When the Rev. Gentleman passed further on, he adverted to the wondrous "miracle of Transubstantiation." I have read of one miracle as being wrought by this Transubstantiation. Our friends on the opposite side must believe it, though *we* are not bound to do so. We are told of a certain Saint who existed from Ash-Wednesday to Ascension Thursday on the Eucharist alone! This "miracle" comes to us *attested by the authority of the Breviary*.

We shall now consider some of the other remarks of the Rev. Mr. Edgeworth. He brought us at once to the 26th chapter of Matthew, and he says this was a fulfilment of the 6th of John. We turn to the 26th of Matthew: In the first place it is said in the 26th verse—

“ Whilst they were at supper Jesus took bread and blessed, and broke; and gave to his disciples, and said : Take ye and eat : This is my body.”

In the opening of the verse we read that—“ Jesus took bread”—that he “ blessed it”—that he “ gave it to his disciples”—that he said “ take ye and eat”—(they could only take bread) and then he said, “ This is my body.” That the word “ this” cannot refer to the body of the Lord Jesus is very evident from many parallel passages in the Holy Scriptures. *Where the word “ is” joins words of two different significations, then it means to REPRESENT.* Thus, in the 5th of Ezekiel: there is in the opening of the chapter a certain command—

“ Thou son of man take thee a sharp knife that shaveth the hair; and cause it to pass over thy head and over thy beard : and take thee a balance to weigh in and divide the hair.”

Then in the 5th verse it is said :—

“ Thus saith the Lord God, **THIS IS JERUSALEM.**”

Was the head, the razor, or anything connected with shaving, Jerusalem? yet it is said, “ this is Jerusalem.” There is the word “ is” used in the sense of “ to represent.” In the 13th chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, the word “ is” occurs several times in the sense of “ to represent.” In the parable of the sower, our Lord says :—

“ Hear ye the parable of the sower. When any one heareth the word of the kingdom, and understandeth it not, there cometh the wicked one, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart : **THIS IS HE** that receiveth the seed by the way-side.”

Then he alludes to the stony ground, and says :—

“ **THIS IS HE** that heareth the word,” &c.

and so he proceeds with the remainder of the parable.

But let us come to the Church of Rome, and ask what *she* means in her Litany, when she says that the Virgin Mary is “ the morning star,”—“ the ark of the covenant,”—“ the queen of the heavens,”—“ the queen of the world,”—“ the star of the sea,”—and so on? Is she *really* all these various things? Is she all these at one moment? Or does she assume each of these characters at successive moments? Is she “ a star,” and “ an ark,” and “ a queen,” and “ an intercessor,” and “ a foundation?” But if the word “ is” must be taken in its literal acceptation, she must be so, according to the Church of Rome. Thus *even in the Church of Rome* the word “ is” signifies “ *to represent.*”

Again,—in the canon of the Mass we are told that until *all the words* are pronounced, there is no transub-

stantiation ; that is, until the priest closes the sound of the last letter there is no transubstantiation ; so that when he had pronounced the words, " this is my *bod*—" (or rather, the Latin of them) the bread is not transubstantiated—it was still bread ; for he must say, " this is my *body*," so that by the acknowledgment of Roman Catholics themselves, the word " this " must refer not to the fleshly body of our Lord, but to the bread he was then holding up in his hands. But if these words be interpreted so as to mean his literal body and blood, how numerous are the difficulties that occur in such an interpretation. Our Lord must have held his body in his hand at the same time that he was received by the twelve Apostles ; so that he must then have had thirteen bodies ; he must have had (it is an awkward thing) his two hands in his two hands, and there must have been twelve other bodies of the same person partaken of by the Apostles. These are serious difficulties to meet—very serious, and such as require the strongest and most unquestionable proofs to substantiate them.

But the words in the 27th verse *must* be taken figuratively ; for, as Mr. Edgeworth acknowledges, it was the " contents " of the chalice, and not the " chalice " itself which was changed. He says, " What did it contain ? Blood ;"—then he adds, " it was the blood which was about to be shed." The Evangelist says, " Taking THE CHALICE, he gave thanks." If we are to interpret the 26th verse literally, I would ask the Church of Rome to *take this 27th verse also literally, and thus make the chalice the Lord Jesus Christ*. It is not the " contents," but "*the chalice*," which, *according to the Roman Catholic system of interpretation*, is changed into the blood of the Lord Jesus.

" TAKING THE CHALICE, he gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of THIS, for THIS IS MY BLOOD of the new testament—(this chalice that he was then holding in his hand)—which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins."

As Mr. Edgeworth was reading out of the Protestant version of the Holy Scripture, he used the word " is " unwittingly, whereas, both *in the canon of the Mass*, and *in the Latin translation of the Bible*, it is not " the blood which is shed," but " the blood which SHALL BE shed ;" evidently shewing that there *had been as yet* no shedding of blood, and therefore shewing that it was impossible for the disciples to drink the blood, when it was not yet drawn from the veins of Christ. Our Lord then shews us his meaning, when he says :—

“I will not drink from henceforth of THIS FRUIT OF THE VINE, until that day when I shall drink it with you new in the kingdom of my Father.”

Thus Christ clearly tells us that the wine in the chalice still continued what it was, even “the fruit of the vine,” that there was no transubstantiation, that there was no physical change effected in it.

We were also referred to the 11th chap. of the 1st Corinthians, and Mr. Edgeworth read us various passages therefrom. In the 23rd verse Paul shews what he received of Christ; in the 24th verse he goes on to specify particulars, namely, the account concerning the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper; in the 25th verse he uses the word “chalice:”—“This chalice is the new testament of my blood;”—in the 26th verse he still calls it “the bread and the chalice;” in the 27th verse, “the bread and the chalice;” in the 28th verse, “the bread and the chalice.” The Apostle Paul, by using these words, “bread,” and “chalice,” so frequently, shews that he did not believe in any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine; for if he received this dogma, he would not have so repeatedly called it “bread and chalice.”

Mr. Edgeworth dwelt for some time on the 26th verse:

“As often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall shew the death of the Lord until he come.”

Mr. Tottenham adverted to the circumstance of Christ being absent from this world in a bodily form, and shewed from this verse that the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper could not contain his actual body; for we are commanded to “eat this bread,” and “drink this chalice,” “*until he come.*” Holy Scripture of the New Testament informs us of *only two* personal comings of our Lord; the *first* coming in order to suffer and atone for sin, and “bring in an everlasting righteousness;”—the first coming in order that he might procure gifts for men,—and bear up his own sacrifice before his Father’s throne in heaven, and from thence pour down the richest blessings on the children of *men*: and his *second* coming, when he is to appear—

“In a flame of fire, yielding vengeance to them who know not God, and who obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.” 2 Thes. i. 8.

In the day of his *second* coming we are told that “*every eye shall see him,*” and he “shall come *in the clouds of heaven.*” In the 1st chapter of the Acts we are informed that, when the Apostles were gazing up to heaven after the

ascended Saviour, two men stood by them, and told them, "*In like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven, so shall he come again.*" He ascended in his *bodily* form, and they were *to see him* come again to the world *in the same manner*. But according to the doctrine of Transubstantiation he comes every day, and it may be every hour of the day, *invisibly* on the altars of the Roman Church. In these wafers he is *not seen*, and yet it is promised "that every eye *shall see him*," when he comes "*the second time* without sin unto the salvation of his people."

But again, the Rev. Gentleman also introduced the 29th verse:—

"He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord."

And he asks this question: "How was it possible that we could be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord, unless the body and blood were actually present?" It is very easy to comprehend this, if we will compare it with other passages in the word of God. The word "discerning" is used in Scripture in a spiritual, and not in a bodily sense; for were it bodily presence that was here intended, the word "discern" would not have been used. The Apostle Paul is reproofing the Corinthians because they did not spiritually discern the commemoration of the Lord's death in the bread and wine laid before them. He blames them for abusing the Sacrament,—for eating too much of the bread, and drinking so much of the wine *as to cause intoxication*. Now *if it were the blood of Jesus which was in the chalice*, that "blood which cleanseth from all sin," *it could never be the cause of such iniquity*. It appears that the blood in the chalice, contrary to our notions of blood, is of an intoxicating quality; but as we have never drunk human blood in the Protestant Church, we leave such cannibalism to the Church of Rome, and we call on her to tell us how it can intoxicate him who drinks of it.

Compare the 1st Corinthians, 2d chapter, 12th verse. Spiritual discernment is there spoken of—

"Now we have received not the spirit of this world, but the spirit that is of God, that we may know the things that are given us from God."

Then the Apostle goes on to the 14th verse—

"But the sensual man perceiveth not these things that are of the Spirit of God, for it is foolishness to him, and he cannot understand because it is spiritually examined" (discerned).

Here is the true reason why they could not "discern the

body of the Lord," because it was not there substantially but spiritually, and the carnal mind that comes to the sacrament without faith cannot discern the nature of the things there represented. The Apostle says, "He cannot understand because it is spiritually examined." Then he adds, "But the spiritual man judgeth all things and he himself is judged of no man." In these verses he interprets the meaning of the word "discerning," and shews us clearly that it was not the bodily but the spiritual presence of the Lord that was there. . .

We are also asked in what manner could mere bread shew forth the death of the Lord, and are then told, that "Roman Catholics have the true faith, because they believe that the body and blood of Christ Jesus are in the sacrament." Now, both in Protestants and Roman Catholics, it must be an act of *faith*—for did any Roman Catholic ever SEE the body and blood of Christ? Did he ever see it in the Eucharist? Did he ever SEE the number of his limbs—the features of his face—the various motions of a living body? I believe he cannot *see* these things, and therefore the Roman Catholic is bound, as we are, to receive it *by faith*. It is by faith that we spiritually eat the body and drink the blood of Christ; and the Roman Catholics must receive it by faith, because they cannot see the body and blood of the Lord as there present.

As I have but a short time at present to speak on this subject, I will make a few remarks on what Mr. Brown has said. He tells us, that sacrifice was necessary in order *to apply* the sacrifice of Christ: this subject we shall consider more largely when we come to the Sacrifice of the Mass, and I pass therefore to another assertion which he made regarding the 6th chapter of John, that, he said, would put an end to the argument. In the 64th verse it is written,—

"It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.

Then the interpretation which is given by an infallible teacher, of an infallible church, is, that the flesh there means corrupt flesh. Now, when I examine different parts of this chapter, I find that the word "flesh" is applied to our Lord, and, if it signify literal flesh—then, that must be applied to the literal flesh of our Lord. I do not say that this is its meaning, but Roman Catholics desire to have it thus interpreted—and therefore, if, according to Mr. Brown, it signifies corrupt flesh, then the

Reverend Gentleman has fallen into the heresy of those who say that our Lord took a body defiled and contaminated with sin, but Holy Scripture tells us, that he was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners." In the 19th and 20th verses of the 10th chap. of Hebrews, the word flesh is used to signify the real flesh of the Lord Jesus Christ:—

"Having therefore, brethren, confidence in the entering into the Holiest by the blood of Christ; a new and living way which he hath dedicated for us through the veil, that is to say, his flesh."

Here the word "flesh" is not used in the sense of corruption. I am willing to grant that, in many parts of Scripture, it is used in the sense of corruption; but, in the 6th chapter of John, according to the Roman interpretation it is applied to the flesh of Jesus, and therefore it cannot be corrupt. In the 64th verse, therefore, the word "flesh" cannot mean corrupt or contaminated flesh—"It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." How is it possible, that that which is natural could nourish that which is spiritual? It is the Spirit only that can act on spirit,—first, for its conversion, then for its enlargement into the glorious liberty, wherewith the Lord Jesus maketh free. We might partake of human flesh, day after day, according to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, but how would our souls be benefited thereby? That flesh must, like all other flesh, "perish in the using." We would still require spiritual food, for by that which is natural or material, our souls never could be strengthened,—never could grow and increase into the "measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." It is "by the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus that we are made free from the law of sin and death," and it is by the very same "Spirit taking of the things of Jesus, and shewing them to our souls," that we are strengthened and comforted from time to time. It is by means of this Spirit that we are brought into union and fellowship with the Lord Jesus. It is, spiritually, that we eat the food that the Lord has given us. We there, in spirit, behold as it were the death and sufferings of Jesus, represented to us in the emblems which he has given us. And, in the sacrament, whilst we are commemorating the dying love of our Lord, we should also bear in remembrance our own sins, that caused him to die so painful, so accursed a death as that of Calvary's cross. In the communion of the Lord's supper our souls should partake of joy as flowing to us from a sense of the love of Christ, there



represented, whilst at the same time we should be abased to the dust in ourselves, when we herein are taught the depths of iniquity within us—the exceeding sinfulness of our hearts, which nothing but the blood of Jesus can cleanse away—even the blood of “the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world.”

---

THE REV. T. J. BROWN.

AFTER the protest that had been entered by Mr. Tottenham, in the last week's discussion, against the Catholic advocates dictating, as he charged us with doing, how the Almighty ought to act, I did not indeed expect that we should have heard of difficulties suggested by human reason against *the mystery* which I advocate. I had, however, cautioned you against them by calling your attention to the fact, that difficulties of the same character were raised by the Jews, when our divine Master declared that he would give them his flesh, “*How,*” they said, “can this man give us his flesh to eat.” Yet such objections have been, again and again, during the speech of Mr. Lyons, addressed to you, in order that your faith may not be established *upon the word of God*; that testimony to which alone you should appeal, when the contested object of Revelation is a mystery.—Similar difficulties have, indeed, oftentimes been adduced by opponents of Protestantism against the most essential doctrines of Revelation. How, then, is it possible for a minister of the Established Church to defend *his own* creed with consistency, after he has thus set an example, in his attack upon *ours*,—of scrutinizing the obscurities of faith by the faint light of human reason and the weak judgment of man? The consequences are fatal to revealed religion if this examination by man of the secrets of God be permitted. Toulmin, in his *Life of Socinus*, defending his appeal to reason against the mysteries of the Incarnation, writes:—

“There is no other way of evading the force of the Papist's argument for Transubstantiation, from the express words of the institution.”

Spinoza endeavoured, by a like process, to explain away the mystery of the Trinity, and all other mysteries. How did the defenders of Christianity, Protestant as well as

Catholic, meet his speculations? By protesting against his impious daring, and the abuse of man's reasoning faculties, as I now find it my duty to do against similar excesses of Mr. Lyons.

Perusing lately the excellent work of the distinguished Protestant, Abbadie, "*Sur la Religion Chrétienne*," I was much interested in observing the principles which, in his 3rd vol., p. 329 and following pages, he defends the mysteries of our common faith, especially the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, against the sophisms and difficulties which the infidel Smalcus endeavoured to collect, from their alleged contradiction to the human understanding. Smalcus maintained that it was absurd to believe any thing contrary to reason; and hence he came to this conclusion, that if the Scriptures did evidently assert that God was made flesh, yet he would not believe it as being unreasonable; because, said he, reason was given to man that he might determine thereby what should be admitted into his creed, and what should be rejected. In refutation of this impious position, Abbadie argues, in the 1st place, that the principle of Smalcus overturns all gospel truth; "For it has pleased God," he says, quoting the Apostle in 1 Cor. i. 21, "by the foolishness of our preaching to save them that believe." The Christian, therefore, ought to look up to the word of God, as to the motive and groundwork on which to establish religious truth, and not be guided by reason in opposition to the light of revelation. He contends, in the second place, and I particularly urge this in opposition to the line of argument taken up by Mr. Lyons, 1st, that to argue from reason against a *mystery* is to destroy faith; for "we walk by faith, and not by sight," 2 Cor. v. 9. 2ndly, that it destroys or renders grace unavailing; for if nothing is to be believed but what we can comprehend by the feeble and obscure light of our understanding, it follows that grace would not be necessary to faith; it follows, also, that the Apostle is wrong when he declares in Heb. xi. 1, that "faith is the evidence of things hoped for, the substance of things *not seen*." In the third place, Abbadie argues that if nothing is to be believed which surpasses the comprehension of reason, revelation becomes useless—God has no means within his power whereby he may be able to dissipate the darkness which involves the human understanding—and man may proudly prefer his own knowledge to that of God. A fourth argument brought by Abbadie is, that if men

were not to believe except what they understand, the Almighty Being, to whom we owe submission on every point, would not receive from us as much obedience as parents do from their children, who believe many things exclusively on the authority of their testimony. He contends, in the fifth place, that if the sanction of reason must first be had, God would lose thereby his right to command the proud mind of man to submit. He puts forward this objection on the part of Smalcus:—"Reason is the foundation of faith; therefore faith cannot be more certain than reason." Abbadie answers, that reason, it is true, has to furnish the motives upon which the credibility of a doctrine is established; but the moment sufficient motives of credibility point out revelation, that moment we are to dismiss the objections of reason, and to receive the revealed truth, purely and solely because *God* has manifested it. Hence he comes to this conclusion (and it is very applicable to the objections that are urged against the Catholic rule), that the positions of Smalcus are blasphemies; that if the proofs contrary to the mystery of the Incarnation of God were a thousand times stronger than they really are, and that if it appeared to us *a thousand times more absurd* and more difficult to be believed, yet the moment we find it manifested *by the God of truth* we are bound to believe it. To the objections of the Rev. Mr. Lyons I beg to return similar answers; and to add that I tremble for him and the Protestant Church, if he and its ministers continue to set an example, such as he has shown, to those who are disposed to attack the mysteries of faith by their apparent opposition to reason. The actual state of Protestantism in Germany displays a dreadful warning, where the whole system of revelation is overturned by *ministers of the Protestant Church, and by Protestant Professors of Theology*, precisely because they find it at apparent variance with their human notions.

I shall now notice some of the objections of Mr. T. which have not been replied to. I must own that I am always at a loss how to afford him satisfaction. At one time he calls upon us to put forward arguments for our doctrine, and then he says we ought to answer his objections. I was perplexed by this difficulty during the discussion of the last week, and I am now again similarly circumstanced; but I will endeavour to extricate myself first by replying briefly to his objections, and then going on with my defence.

His first objection, from the Catechism of the Council of Trent, which declares Christ to be present in the Eucharist with his bones and nerves, has been answered by my Rev. Friend near me. I wish to observe, in addition, that the Catholic faith is, that the body and blood of Christ are *wholly* and *substantially* present in the Eucharist, which doctrine is based upon the word of God. When, therefore, the Catechism of the Council of Trent *more explicitly* declares *how* the body and blood of Christ are *wholly* and *substantially* present, it cannot mean to contradict that simple exposition of our doctrine which in my first speech I read to you from the Council of Trent itself. What, then, we are called upon to believe is, that Christ is present substantially and *wholly*; understanding *the manner* of his presence to be such as the Council of Trent represents it; that is, that Christ is present in the Eucharist, with his bones and nerves, not after a *visible* manner, not *after the manner of a natural body*, but after a mysterious, spiritual, and *sacramental* manner; that is, a manner beyond our conception, as, in their controversies with Unitarians, our opponents of other creeds must acknowledge that it surpasses their comprehension *how* Christ, being man, was, notwithstanding, really and truly God.

The Rev. Gentleman remarked that my arguments were *ad captandum*, when I said that all ages concurred in my exposition of the 6th chap. of St. John; but you may recollect that, anticipating his objection, I only stated that it was *generally* so explained by the interpreters of all ages, for I was aware that there were a few, a very few, however, compared with the immense mass of Catholics, who expounded it differently. The Catholic Church exercises, indeed, no tyranny over its subjects; on points where faith is not immediately concerned, and in interpreting passages of Scripture which are not essential to the establishment of a defined doctrine, it leaves us to exercise our own judgment. Accordingly, on the preceding days, I told the Rev. Gentleman of the other side, that we are allowed to use our own discretion, except in those matters whereon the Church, supported by the Spirit of God, has defined what we are to believe. Although, therefore, in their interpretation of the 6th chapter of St. John, some few Roman Catholics have differed from the great majority of their brethren, yet, exercising lawfully my judgment, I cannot hesitate in adopting that commonly received exposition which I have laid before you, and which

has not been at all disproved by any arguments of my Rev. opponents.

Mr. T. objects that, by excepting Luther from the number of our adversaries on the doctrine of the real presence, I was guilty of a misstatement, because, he says, Luther did not believe in *transubstantiation*, but *consubstantiation*. What has that to do with my argument? *We are not discussing the doctrine of transubstantiation*; that is, whether, as Catholics profess, Christ is present by a total change of the elements, or by the introduction of a second substance, as Luther maintained. All that I advanced was the fact, that Luther held with us the substantial presence of Christ.

Mr. T. tells you that, according to me, the multitude ought always to have understood the meaning of Christ's words, and he thereupon quotes an occasion on which it mistook them. I did not say that Christ was bound always to speak clearly and manifestly, but what I maintain is that, when from the context it appears that Christ is speaking plainly and manifestly, we are authorized to understand his words according to their ordinary acceptance. If, indeed, the discourses of our divine Teacher are not to be understood literally, when there is no appearance of figure (as in the 6th chap. of St. John, from the 53rd to the 59th verse) where he employs expressions so clear and precise, *that none* more so could have been chosen, what satisfactory rules can be given to direct men in exercising their alleged right of private judgment.

We are told, that the meaning of Christ is sufficiently explained by the 64th verse of the same 6th chapter of St. John :—

“ There are some of you that believe not, but Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him.”

From this it is argued, if I understand the objection, that the reprimand of some of Christ's disciples was for unbelief in him, with a particular reference to Judas Iscariot, mentioned in the latter part of the verse,—“ who should betray him.” Now I invite your attention to the context, and you will find two distinct propositions; the first of which regards those who did not believe the words of Christ, the second him who should betray him; and of both it is declared that he knew them from the beginning. But the former part of the verse, that there were some who believed not, can apply to those only, who in verses 52, 53, and 60, refused belief in the *real manducation* of his flesh.

Mr. Tottenham observes that, in the Mosaic law, absti-

nence from blood was enjoined: whence he argues that what is said in this chapter, of the blood of Christ being given to the Jews to drink, was necessarily to be understood in a figurative, not in a literal sense. Did we hold the meaning of Christ to be that his blood was to be drank according to the gross manner which the Jews supposed, and as it was prohibited in the old law, then, indeed, Mr. Tottenham might attach some importance to his objection. It was, probably, some such difficulty which the Jews contemplated when they said, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" But it is not against the drinking of our Saviour's blood according to the Catholic belief that such an objection should be raised; for we do not maintain that Christ gives us his blood to drink, after the *natural* manner in which is drank the blood of victims that have been offered in sacrifice, but, as I have stated repeatedly, *after a spiritualized, mysterious, and sacramental manner*. It is only by Protestants bearing in mind this correct notion of our doctrine, that I can have a chance of justice being done to the truths I defend. Accordingly, in the early part of this day's discussion, I warned you how your prejudices would be appealed to against us, and in what difficulty I should be placed in advocating doctrines, concerning which you have had very erroneous ideas impressed upon you from your infancy.

My Rev. opponent contended that my argument proved too much; that it matters not what a man's faith is, unless he receives the body and blood of Christ. My argument did not attempt to prove any such thing. I contended that there is a divine command on the part of Christ for all to participate of his body and blood; whence it follows that those who have the means are as much bound to partake of the body and blood of our Saviour, as every man is enjoined to believe all the doctrines of revelation, so soon as they are proposed to him; according to the words of Christ in Mark xvi. 16—

"Go preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not, shall be damned."

As, therefore, damnation is the consequence of the rejection of any one of the known doctrines of revelation, which was the point I endeavoured to establish during the discussion on the former three days, it is equally true by the declaration of Christ, that every man who has it in his power, and who *is, or ought to be*, persuaded by the arguments proposed to him of the reality of the body and blood of

Christ in the sacrament of the altar, that, if he has it in his power, he is bound to participate thereof. But if Mr. Tottenham means that faith alone will save a man, he himself has to contend with a difficulty similar to that in which he wishes to involve me. In the 3rd chapter of St. John's Gospel, verse 3, Christ said—

“ Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God.”

Hereupon his Church professes that baptism is of *ordinary necessity*. Now, Mr. T. has as much to do in order to reconcile this with his notion of the sufficiency of faith alone, as he imagines I have in extricating myself from his objection.

But, he goes on, according to the Roman Catholic interpretation,—no matter how wicked a man may be, if he eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ; for Christ says:—

“ He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood shall have eternal life.”

I wish then, to ask Mr. T. whether *he now* maintains that the words of Scripture are to be *always* understood literally, without any exercise of man's discretion and judgment upon their true meaning? When in St. Luke chap. xi. 10. we are assured by Jesus Christ, that “ Every one that asketh receiveth,”—can any one pretend that these words are to be taken in their *strictly literal* meaning: that whatever man says, “ O Lord, grant me this or that,” although his heart be full of evil, and of impure desires, and he meditate wickedness at the very moment whilst he is in the presence of God, that such a one shall receive what he asketh? Now as you expound this text, not of the wicked man, but of him who repents, and petitions with worthy dispositions, so are we justified in putting a similar interpretation upon the promise of Christ in the 6th chapter of St. John, that, “ Every man that eateth his flesh and drinketh his blood shall be saved,” provided his disposition be such as the excellency of the sacrament requires.

The Rev. Gentleman argues that, from this chapter, all are bound to receive the communion under both kinds, under the form of bread and the form of wine. This, however, is a topic which does not belong strictly to the subject before us, and I will therefore answer merely in the words of the Council of Trent, Sess. 21. cap. 1 :—

“ He who said :—‘ Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you,’ has likewise said :—‘ If any one shall eat of *this bread*, he shall live for ever;’ and he who said :—‘ He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life,’ likewise said :—‘ The



*bread* that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world ;'—he, in fine, who said :—he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me, and I in him,' hath nevertheless said :—' he who eateth *this bread* shall live for ever.' ”

Mr. T. quoted the 34th and 35th verses of the 6th chap. to show our Saviour's meaning to be that *by faith* we are all to partake of him. You may recollect, however, that when I was expounding the 35th verse, I observed that hitherto there was an obscurity about the words of Christ, and that our Saviour's true meaning was only afterwards manifested from ver. 51. to ver. 59.

Mr. T. adduced an objection against the real and bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist, from St. Matt. xxvi. 26. wherein Christ said :—

“ I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, till I drink it new in the kingdom of my Father.”

Now, in the first place, if Mr. T. will look at Luke xxii. 17—20, he will find a solution of his difficulty, which was pointed out by St. Fulgentius, in the primitive ages of the Christian Church.

The 17th and 18th verses are as follows :—

“ He took the cup, and gave thanks and said, Take this and divide it among yourselves. For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come.”

Here we find the objection that has been urged ; but afterwards in the 20th verse *another* and different *cup* is mentioned, and it is of this second cup that Christ says :—

“ This cup is the New Testament in my blood which is shed for you.”

Thus mention is made is made of *two different cups* or chalices ; the objection is borrowed from the language spoken of the *first* chalice ; our faith is founded upon the terms applied to the *second*. But, in the second place, *we* sometimes call the sacramental appearance of the Eucharist bread and wine ; for we are accustomed to speak of things as they appear to our senses. Accordingly, in the book of Exodus vii. 12. Aaron's rod, after it had been changed into a serpent, is still called a rod : and in the Gospel of John ii. 9. the water after it was changed into wine, is still called water.

To the objection from 1 Cor. xi. 23—28. where, after the consecration, the Eucharist is still spoken of as bread and wine, my answer is the same as above ; that Scripture, after a substantial change, does not always speak of the thing according to what it is become, as in the instance of Aaron's rod in Exodus chap. 7., which was called a rod after it had become a serpent.—Mr. T. says that commemoration

and remembrance signify absence; they signify, indeed, that there is no *visible presence*, but they do not signify that there is no presence whatsoever. We commemorate the presence of God when we pray to Him: yet we believe that God is every where present; “for in him we live, and move, and have our being.” By prayer, therefore, and frequent reflection upon God we call him to mind, not implying thereby that we consider him to be absent, but because he is not sensibly present, but after an invisible and spiritual manner.

Mr. T. quoted from the 3rd chapter of Acts, ver. 21, wherein it is said of Christ, “Whom the heavens must receive until the time of the restitution of all things.” In order to meet the difficulty which he raised therefrom against the possibility of Christ’s bodily presence in the Eucharist, I must recal your attention to the statement of the Catholic doctrine, which I read to you from the decree of the Council of Trent, wherein it is said, that although we believe Christ to be truly present in the Eucharist, we do not pretend that he is present after a *natural* manner of existence, but only after a *mysterious* and *sacramental* manner; constituting thereby not two distinct bodies, but two different manners in which the same body exists. Moreover, if Mr. T. will insist upon his objection, let him explain how Christ, being *in heaven* until the time of the restitution of all things, appeared to St. Paul *on earth*, as we read in Acts ix. 4—8?

“And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest; it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he, trembling and astonished, said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do.”

If, therefore, Mr. T.’s objection is of any weight against us, it may just as well be urged by infidels against the apparent discrepancy between the 3rd and 9th chapters of the Acts. I might refer you to several other passages in which the presence of Christ, even to mortal sight, after his ascension, is related in the most explicit terms. In 1 Cor. xv. 8, you will find that Christ appeared to St. Paul, and *was seen of him*; you will find it likewise recorded in Acts vii. 56, that St. Stephen saw Christ; yet it is not to be supposed that the eyes of a mortal man penetrated into the heaven of heavens, where Christ resides. Hence the text adduced does not prove that Christ cannot be present on earth at the same time that he is present in

heaven, especially as we suppose that the mode of his presence in the sacrament is not after the manner of a material, but of a spiritualized body. Lastly, I contend that this text ought not to be urged against us at all, because the meaning of the original Greek is ambiguous; accordingly we find that Hammond, Camerarius, Beza, and other Protestant divines understand by the original of this passage, "that Christ took possession of heaven *for the government thereof*," and not that he is now in heaven never to be again on earth, *in any manner*, until the last judgment. Thus, even according to its literal signification, it does not bear out Mr. T.'s meaning.

Of the difficulties raised by Mr. Lyons I mean to take but little notice. He contended that the words of Christ could not refer to a literal eating, because in the old law the sin-offering was not eaten. But why, I ask, are we in the new law to be bound by the rites prescribed in the old?—or why could Christ, who came to institute a new sacrifice, that of himself on the cross, not also institute the manducation of his sacramental body and blood without being bound by the prohibitions of the old law?

One objection I find that I have passed by. Mr. T. contended that the 6th chapter of John was to be understood of a receiving by faith only. Christ, he said, is there speaking of *actually* bestowing himself in food; the Jews, therefore, could not understand him of any *future* participation of his real body and blood in the sacrament which was not to be instituted until long afterwards. We find, however, in the 51st verse, where Christ describes the manner in which he is to be received, that he says, "the bread which I *will* give is my flesh." It is evident, therefore, from the express words of Jesus Christ that he speaks of a *future* eating and drinking of his body and blood.

It is now time that I should resume my arguments in support of the *real* presence, or, (since Mr. T. objects to that term,) of the bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist. These arguments are deduced from the institution of the sacrament as it is recorded by the evangelists. The terms in which that institution is related having been recently read to you by my Rev. Friend who preceded me, I shall not trespass upon your time by repeating them; but if you will attend, 1st, to the manner in which the evangelists relate the institution of the sacrament—2ndly, to the language which Christ employs—3rdly, to the subject matter of the institution—4thly, to the time

at which that institution was made—you will be convinced that the words of Christ are to be understood in their plain and literal sense. To-morrow I purpose to review clearly and fully the objections that have been and may be brought against their literal meaning; and I trust that I shall be able to satisfy those whose minds are not already convinced, that, according to the laws of figurative language, it is impossible for the words of Christ to mean in this place a merely figurative presence; which, moreover, not one circumstance of the institution warrants.

In the first place, then, if we look to the usual *manner in which the evangelical narration* is conducted, we shall repeatedly find the inspired writers solicitous to guard their readers against mistakes in matters of far less importance than the real or symbolical presence, in the Lord's Supper, of the body and blood of Christ. Thus, St. Luke ch. iii. v. 25. in mentioning the reputed *Father* of Jesus, who had truly taken flesh of his Virgin Mother, lest any mistake might arise that Christ had been begotten like other men, the Evangelist cautions against such an error, by saying: "being *as was supposed* the son of Joseph."—In like manner, in chap. xii. 1. having recorded the warning of our Divine Master; "Beware ye of the *leaven* of the Pharisees," he immediately adds, in order to prevent mistake, the explanation given by Christ of his meaning: "which is *hypocrisy*."—In St. John's Gospel, ii. 19. we read: "And Jesus answered and said unto them, destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." Lest, however, any error might ensue, the same Evangelist, in the 21st verse, explains the figurative expression of our Lord: "But he spake of *the temple of his body*."—In St. Matthew, xi. 14. we read: "If ye will receive it, *this is Elias*, which was for to come;" which is interpreted in the 1st chap. of St. Luke's Gospel, verse 17:—"He shall go before him *in the spirit and power of Elias*, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just." From these passages I repeat, that if the Evangelists are so cautious to prevent errors, in matters of much less moment than the *bodily* or the *figurative* presence of Christ in the Eucharist, assuredly in this instance they would not have left us without some warning, were the language which they employ intended not to be understood literally. By what system, then, of interpretation do you make out, that the words of the institution imply not a real, but a figurative pre-

sence? especially as they do most explicitly, in their natural meaning, express a real and substantial presence. In fact, there is no one hint of a figure in the evangelical narration.

Let us, in the 2nd place, look at the language of Christ: "This," says he, "is my body."—"This is my blood." Now, it is manifest that we ought not to understand in any but their literal sense the words of Christ, and of the inspired writers, if we wish to come at their true meaning; unless we have some solid ground on which to build our figurative interpretation. If the Scripture is sometimes to be explained figuratively, it at least cannot be so where the literal meaning is obvious and natural; but only in those cases where its language is clearly expressive of figure; or when, from certain conventional observances, it is evident that men are speaking figuratively; or when there is given some intimation that figurative language is intended. But when Jesus Christ, at the institution of the Sacrament, taking bread in his hands, said: "this is my body;" the bread was not *obviously* and naturally a figure of Christ's body;—nor was it *conventionally* a figure of his body, for it was never agreed among mankind that the body of Christ should be represented by bread;—nor did Christ *intimate* that he meant bread to be a figure of his body. Therefore, I contend that Protestants have no right whatever to interpret those words of Christ figuratively; that, on the contrary, there can be no words more clear, none more expressive of his real and true bodily presence. Our Divine Instructor was not bound, on all occasions, to lay aside figures of speech; but when we hear him declare of the bread: "This is my body," and of the wine: "This is my blood;" when he does speak thus clearly, it is a wicked wresting of the meaning of Christ's words, to give them a figurative interpretation.

Let us observe, in the 3rd place, *the subject matter* of the institution. The Protestants of the Established Church are surely willing to acknowledge, that when Christ instituted the Eucharist, he proposed a doctrine of *faith*;—that he instituted a *sacrament*;—that he gave a *commandment*;—that he bequeathed a *testament* to his Apostles and their successors. Now, every one of these circumstances requires that his meaning should be most unquestionable. First, where a doctrine of *faith* is proposed, figurative language would be misplaced. Every word should then be clear; for there is such a natural tendency to error and division amongst mankind, that it would almost be lead-

ing them into heresy, were a doctrine of faith to be announced in figurative terms. Secondly, a *Sacrament* ought to be proposed in words, the meaning of which is manifest. Accordingly, whenever we meet with the *institution* of a sacrament in the new law, we find that the terms whereby it is expressed, are free from ambiguity. If, on such an occasion, there be any figure employed, it is—either when describing the *effects* of a sacrament, and not when recording its institution ; as in St. John iii. 3 :—

“ Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God ; ”—

—where the figurative term, *born again*, is used in reference to the effects only of baptism ;—or when the meaning of the figure is *quite evident*. Thus, in a passage of St. Luke’s Gospel, chap. xxii. verse 20, which is frequently objected to us :—

“ This cup is the new testament in my blood which is shed for you ; ”—

—the word *cup* is indeed to be taken figuratively ; but it is a figure so common, and so well understood, that there is no more danger of any mistake whatever, than that a man, who has been told to drink *a glass of wine*, could imagine that he must swallow not merely the wine, but *the glass* besides. There is then a wide difference between the figure expressed by the words :—“ This *cup* is the new testament in my blood ; ” and any figure said to be contained in those others :—“ *This* is my body ; ” “ *This* is my blood.”

---

THE REV. E. TOTTENHAM.

MR. CHAIRMAN,—Mr. Brown complains sadly to-day, as he did frequently during the discussion on the Rule of Faith, of the difficulty in which he is placed. He says, that if he answers our objections, we tell him to prove his own doctrine ; and if he attempts to prove his own doctrine, we tell him to answer our objections. Now my Rev. opponent may consider *this* a difficulty, but I want to put him in a still greater one, namely, *to do both the one and the other* ; to prove his own position, and also to answer the objections that are started against it.

In the observations which I shall make in my present address, I shall first, in following up the remarks of my friend, notice a few of Mr. Edgeworth’s statements ; and then occupy the remainder of my time in replying to Mr.

Brown. Mr. Edgeworth seems to imitate the example of his Rev. friend, by enlarging much on the 6th chap. of John, and he has repeatedly told us *that Christ said* he would give his body and blood, and that it is our business to believe the words that Christ has uttered. Now it is quite useless for the two Rev. Gentlemen to be telling us again and again that Christ said he would give his body and blood; and to be reminding us that Christ used the words: "This is my body," or, "This is my blood." There is no dispute about *that*; we all admit that our Lord *used the expressions*: but the real point in dispute is, *what is the sense in which he used them?* Nothing is therefore established by ringing changes on the simple fact that the words were *used*, unless there be solid reasons adduced to shew that they are to be taken in a *literal*, and not a figurative sense.

Mr. Edgeworth dwelt upon the passage in the 6th of John, about the "bread which came down from heaven;" and he seemed to fancy he had placed Protestants in rather an awkward predicament, when he said, "I believe our friends would give only *bread from the earth*." The Rev. Gentleman may believe this, but I can tell him that it is not the fact. It is true that we do not take *his* interpretation of this passage; but it is equally true that we do not give the people merely bread from earth. For what is the meaning of the term "bread from heaven," of which our Lord speaks? He means not by it the descent of the manna in the wilderness, but the descent of him who was God, to take unto him our nature.

"The bread of God is that which *cometh down from heaven*, and giveth life to the world."—Verse 33.

This is the bread which is to be fed upon *by faith*, even "GOD MANIFEST IN THE FLESH,"—and this *spiritual manducation of the soul* is that which is far more intimately connected with the eternal interests of man than the *literal reception by the mouth* of the actual body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist.

The Rev. Gentleman has also indulged in a twofold lamentation over Protestants. He tells us, *first*, that Protestants do not believe the words of Christ; and, *secondly*, that they do not believe that the body of Christ is in the Eucharist.

With regard to the first lamentation, it is a mere nothing, for Protestants *do* profess to believe the words of Christ, and the dispute between them and Roman Catholics is, *as to the manner in which those words are to be un-*



*derstood.* And as to Protestants not believing that *the literal, substantial, body* of Christ is in the Eucharist—(so far as I can see at present, and so far as this discussion has thrown light upon the subject) I do not think *this* is a great subject for lamentation. While, however, I regard not the subjects of Mr. Edgeworth's lamentation, I yet beg you to bear in mind one point which he has urged. He has told you, when you go home this day, in the solitude of the chamber to read the 6th of John, and he has exhorted you to seek the Divine assistance, that you may understand it, and he anticipates great things to his cause as the result of all this. *I* tell you to do just *the same*; to read that chapter throughout; to read it not partially, not taking one clause or one expression, and omitting another; but to read it in all its bearings, and to look, with a believing and prayerful heart, for the blessing of the Spirit of God, and you will pardon me for saying that, under such circumstances, I have just as good anticipations as to the result as the Rev. Mr. Edgeworth.

But Mr. E. thinks he has found me "*inadvertently committing myself*," just as Mr. Brown thought several times in the discussion on the Rule of Faith. I asserted that, before Roman Catholics could derive any assistance from the 6th of John, with respect to Transubstantiation, it was incumbent on them *to prove that it refers at all to the Sacrament*. How then does Mr. Edgeworth attempt to catch me committing myself? He brings us back to an observation I made on a preceding day, that, if we had only the Gospel of St. John, we should in that case find all essential truth contained in it. I made this assertion upon the testimony of the Gospel itself which says:—

"These are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing you may have life in his name."—John xx. 31.

Now, in connection with that observation of mine, upon which I have *so frequently enlarged* in the discussion on the Rule of Faith, my Rev. opponent reasons thus:—"If," says he, "you impress upon the meeting that the sacrament of the Eucharist is not spoken of in the 6th chapter of John, what other proof have you, in that gospel, of the sacrament at all?" and then he refers to the Book of Common Prayer which says the sacraments are "*generally necessary to salvation*." I confess I cannot see the difficulty here at all; nor can I discover the awful manner in which I have "*committed myself*." In the first place, the Book of Common Prayer does not declare the sacraments *absolutely*, but *generally*, necessary—that is, when there is

no impossibility or lawful hindrance that they should be administered and received. But what I say, in order to get out of the supposed difficulty, is this :—If it were God's good pleasure that we should have had *only* the gospel of John, and if the 6th chapter does *not* refer to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, then, *in such a case*, that sacrament would not have been *necessary, because it would not have been revealed*. But God has been pleased to give us instruction with respect to that Sacrament from *other* books besides St. John's Gospel, and therefore we hold that *now* it, as well as baptism, may be said to be “generally necessary to salvation.”

I brought an objection against the doctrine of a physical change in the Elements from the account given of the Lord's Supper in the 26th chapter of St. Matthew, and 11th of 1st Corinthians, where, *after* the words of consecration are supposed to be uttered, the Elements are called by *their original names*. Some comments were made upon this objection, and Mr. Edgeworth says,—“They are truly bread and wine *to the testimony of the senses*, but this testimony *is to be set aside* by that of the words of Christ.” Now let me ask our Rev. opponents *how they know that the words of Christ are in the Bible at all?* If they can show me any other way by which they know the expressions, “This is my body, and this is my blood” are in the Bible, *except by the testimony of the senses*, then I shall give up the argument. They *object* to the senses when employed *against* Transubstantiation, and yet *the very foundation of their own belief in that doctrine is nothing but the evidence of the senses!* They know that the words, on which they build that doctrine, are in the Scripture, either by the evidence of the sense of *sight*, by which they behold them; or by the testimony of the sense of *hearing*, when the church or the minister declare their existence. They cannot, I repeat, positively discover *the words* upon which this day they are resting the doctrine of Transubstantiation but by the evidence of the senses, and yet they reject the testimony of the senses with respect to *the substances* which, according to that doctrine, are supposed to be physically changed!

As I am anxious to go to-morrow to the discussion of THE MASS more particularly, I shall take this opportunity of enlarging a little upon this subject of *the senses*, in order to shew that *it is proper to employ them in all cases in which they are capable of being exercised*. I maintain that this is a *Scriptural* method of proceeding. *All miracles*

were brought to the *test of the senses*. If we reject their legitimate testimony, *we lay the foundation of universal scepticism!* not only may we disbelieve *any thing we please* in general matters, but *we have no proof even of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ*, that cardinal doctrine of the Christian faith. The truth of that fact was established, in the first instance, simply by such testimony, and therefore we read, in various passages of Scripture, that, when the Apostles dwelt upon *the fact* of Christ's resurrection, *they always appealed to the evidence of the senses in attestation of its truth*. Look at the 13th chapter of Acts, the 30th and 31st verses:—

“ God raised him (i. e. Christ) from the dead the third day : *who was seen many days*, by them who came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who to this present are *his witnesses* to the people.”

There the proof of the resurrection of Christ is derived simply from the fact that *he was seen* for many days after that event by certain individuals. If you advert further to the 15th chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, you will find the subject of the senses treated of at length : and St. Paul is, in this chapter, speaking of this very circumstance of the resurrection :—

“ Now I make known unto you, brethren, the Gospel which I preached to you, which also you have received, and wherein you stand ; by which also you are saved, if you hold fast after what manner I preached unto you, unless you have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all, which I also received : how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures : and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures.”—

Mark now how *the testimony of the senses*, as to his resurrection, is introduced :—

—“ And that *he was seen* by Cephas ; and after that by the eleven. Then *was he seen* by more than five hundred brethren at once ; of whom many remain until this present, and some are fallen asleep. After that, *he was seen* by James, then by all the Apostles. And last of all, *he was seen* also by me, as by one born out of due time.”—Verses 1—8.

In this passage *the fact* of our Lord's resurrection, which had been *foretold* by the Scriptures, is affirmed. This fact is the foundation stone of the Christian faith, and St. Paul makes its truth to rest upon the circumstance that *he was seen* by the Apostles and others—that is, *upon the testimony of the senses*. Now look at the opening of St. John's 1st Epistle, and what is his language?—

“ That which was from the beginning, which we have *heard*, which we have *seen with our eyes*, which we have *looked upon*, and our *hands have handled*, of the word of life : for the life was manifested ; and we have *seen and do bear witness*, and declare unto you the life eternal, which was with the Father, and hath appeared to us : That which we have *seen* and have *heard*, we declare unto you, that you also may have fellowship with us, and our fellowship may be with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.”—Chap. i. ver. 1—3.

In the former chapter, the 15th of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, there was an appeal to the evidence of *sight*, for the establishment of our Lord's resurrection : and here St. John, when speaking of the Incarnation of the Eternal Word, in terms very analogous to those he uses in the commencement of his Gospel, and *when writing in opposition to those* (the Gnostics) *who said the senses were deceived with respect to the real humanity of Christ*, makes an appeal, not only to the evidence of *sight*, but also to the evidence of *hearing* and of *touch*.

These are a few of the many passages of Scripture from which we prove that *the exercise of our senses is proper in the investigation of things of which the senses can take cognizance*. Let us then apply this to the doctrine of Transubstantiation. There are the elements of bread and wine, and if we *look at* those elements, after consecration, we see that they are bread and wine—if we *taste* them, we have additional proof that they are bread and wine—if, in short, we apply any one of our senses, the same fact is attested, namely, that the bread *remains bread*, and that the wine *remains wine*. Let me not be told (as Mr. Edgeworth has insinuated), that the testimony of the senses *will set aside the words of Christ* at the institution. We contend that it is *in harmony with* those words, rightly understood ; and by using it, *we are only adopting, as I have already stated, the very same means which a Roman Catholic must adopt, in order to ascertain that the words on which he rests his doctrine are in the Bible at all*. I would only repeat, that, if it be again affirmed that the use of the senses, on *our* parts, is not in this matter legitimate, our friends on the other side are called on to answer the question already put, “ How, *except by the evidence of the senses*, do they know, that the words, on which they build their doctrine, are really to be found in the Bible ? ”

I now proceed to notice the observations of Mr. Brown. He says that, after the protest I made—(and to this Mr. Edgeworth also alluded)—he did not expect that the objections which Mr. Lyons started on the ground of reason would be urged against a mystery. He has spoken much of the necessity of not exalting reason above the testimony of Revelation, and in almost all of what he has advanced on this subject I am happy to agree with him. There is, however, a distinction to be observed. I agree with Mr. Brown that, IF A TRUTH BE REVEALED IN THE BIBLE, *be it never so mysterious, we are bound to receive it upon the authority of God*, satisfied that, though *our* finite

understandings may be baffled, God can never reveal a doctrine that involves a *real contradiction*. But Mr. Brown, in objecting to Mr. Lyons' line of argument, in the present case, ASSUMES *that Transubstantiation is a revealed mystery!* This is the point that we *dispute*. We believe that it is *not* revealed.

Besides, if arguments were adduced on this subject *from reason*, these arguments did not occupy the foreground, and stand simply by themselves, thus obtaining a preference over arguments derived from the word of God. The principle we hold is, that, if we are *first* satisfied that any doctrine *is not in the Bible*, we may *then* advert to *reason* on the subject. This is just the order we have followed, and with reference to some arguments, derived even from reason, to which my friend referred, let me tell Mr. Brown that they are expressly sanctioned by Scripture. If he turns to the 24th chapter of St. Luke, in which it is mentioned that the women came to the sepulchre to look for the body of the Lord, he will find it declared in the 6th verse :—

“ He is not here, but is risen.”

Now this expression implied that he could not be, so far as *his body* is concerned, *in two places at one time* : and thus the testimony of *Scripture* supports my friend's argument from *reason*.

There is no parallel, let me say, (though an endeavour has been made to establish one) between the doctrines of the Trinity and of Transubstantiation. The doctrine of the Trinity is totally and entirely *above* our reason, *as the nature of God must necessarily be*, and we have nothing else but the testimony of God himself on which to believe such a doctrine; and as it is too much to expect that man's *finite* understanding could fully grasp *the infinity of DEITY*, it is at once a proud and inconsistent thing to reject the Trinity on the ground that it is *above our comprehension*. But the case is not the same with respect to the doctrine we are now investigating. Transubstantiation is *decidedly contrary* to our reason; we can make out innumerable cases of *contradiction* to reason in it; whilst I maintain on the other hand that objections to the Trinity cannot be derived from the fact that it is *contrary* to reason; for the fact is, that reason can but scantily exercise itself on the Divine essence, and therefore has not sufficient premises from which to draw a legitimate conclusion on the score of contradiction to itself. Reason is *baffled*, *not contradicted*, by the TRINITY — Reason is *expressly contradicted*

by TRANSUBSTANTIATION. Hence, the parallel does not hold good.

Mr. Brown does not seem to be pleased with my statement that some of his arguments were *ad captandum*; particularly that in which he declared that all ages were agreed in the interpretation he gave of the 6th chapter of John. He said he was aware that some Roman Catholics, but very few, *differed* from him in his interpretation of this portion of sacred writ. Now I refer to this again only to make one observation. If some Roman Catholic divines have interpreted the 6th of John in the same manner as Protestants have done, then at all events Mr. Edgeworth will admit that *his* interpretation, upon which he insisted so much, and which he affirms, if not in precise words, yet in substance, to be as clear as the sun, is not so *very* satisfactory and conclusive.

But with regard to the objection drawn from the Mosaic law against the doctrine of Transubstantiation, as mentioned in my first speech to-day, my opponent says, that, if the blood was drunk in a literal manner, then indeed our side might have a triumph on this point; but that this argument does not militate against the Roman Catholic doctrine, for they do not hold that the blood is taken after a *literal* manner. Why, Sir, our friends on the other side all day long have been labouring, (if I may borrow an expression from themselves) to prove that the 6th chapter of John *is to be positively taken in a literal manner*: and really, if the text is to be *literal* and *not literal at the same time*, I think this is almost a greater miracle than Transubstantiation itself!

I come now to the remarks made by the two Rev. Gentlemen on the words of the institution. This is the *second* kind of proof adduced to-day upon the subject under consideration. Mr. Edgeworth repeated the words, "This is my body," and thereupon he asked the question, "*Could he* change the bread into his body?" But the question, Sir, is not, *could* he do it, but, *has he done so*? This is the point at which I wish to arrive. Have we any reason to suppose, from the words he used, that he willed the bread should be changed into his body? I must say that I do not think the observations of Mr. Edgeworth were very generous, when he said that Protestants generally declared it was *not* Christ's body, while Christ himself said, "This *is* my body." Such is an *unfair* representation of what Protestants believe. They do *not* interpret the passage, as if Christ said, "This is *not* my body," in the open manner



stated by the Rev. Gentleman. They believe Christ said, “This is my body,” but the point in dispute is, whether he spoke *literally* or *figuratively* on that occasion ; and, instead of vague and idle declamations, to this point I shall at once come. The words are found in the 26th chapter of St. Matthew, and, as they have been read before, I shall not repeat them now at length. I shall give you a few reasons for my belief that they are to be taken in a figurative, and not in a literal sense.

Mr. Brown has prefaced his observations on this portion of Scripture by saying, that *to-morrow he will meet all the objections*. It was wise in him to prepare your minds in this way. If therefore Mr. Brown intends to meet the objections, I trust my hearers *will bear away those objections* firmly fixed in their minds ; and then investigate impartially whether they are set aside by the observations we are led to expect.

He has also told us that our Lord, when uttering, and the Evangelist, when reciting, the words of the institution, would have been cautious in preventing mistake, and would have given a warning if there were a liability that the words should be misunderstood, which, he contends, was likely, if the passage was to be taken not literally, but figuratively. My position, however, is, that there was no such danger of mistake on the part of those to whom the words were spoken, for the disciples were (from circumstances to which I shall presently advert) *quite prepared* to receive them in the same sense as Protestants do ; nor would there be any such liability *now*, if the passage were viewed, not in a disconnected manner, but according to the general analogy of Scripture. And this leads me at once to *the reasons why I take the passage as speaking figuratively and not literally*. I shall content myself with *three simple reasons* : —

1st. The figurative interpretation of the passage is *according to the general analogy of figurative language in Scripture*. Mr. Lyons has adverted to some instances. He has alluded to the case where the Prophet, speaking of the hair, says, “This is Jerusalem.” There is another passage in which St. Paul, when referring to the rock out of which the water gushed in the desert, for the refreshing of the Israelites, declares, “The rock *was* Christ.” Again, in the 4th chapter of Galatians, we find that the Apostle says of Hagar, “This Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia.” The passages are almost innumerable where this mode of expression occurs : it was *quite common* among



the Jews, and therefore the minds of the disciples must have been *prepared* to receive the words before us in a *figurative* sense. If our opponents now insist that the words "This is my body and this is my blood" are to be taken *literally*, and that they cannot at all bear a figurative interpretation, how could they consistently exclaim against me, if I were to maintain, according to the principle they have adopted, *that the woman Hagar was transubstantiated into a mountain, or the rock into Christ, or a lock of hair into the city of Jerusalem!* Let us have some regular and consistent method of interpreting such passages. My principle is, that *homogeneous passages are to be interpreted homogeneously*. Now, "This is my body"—"The rock was Christ"—"This is Jerusalem," speaking of certain hair—and "Hagar is Mount Sinai"—all these passages, and many others, are of a *similar* description and ought therefore to be interpreted precisely *after the same rule*. If this be *not* adopted, then interpretation will become quite *arbitrary*.

2ndly. The figurative interpretation of this passage *accords with the general mode of speaking in all languages*. Do not we often use the same mode when we do not intend to speak literally? Suppose I were to look at a picture, I should say, "This is a certain person;" and suppose I were to look at a map, I should not hesitate to affirm, "This is Europe, or this is America, or this is some particular country." Were I to use such phraseology, would you suppose I meant to say that the picture was *transubstantiated* into the person, or the map into Europe or America, or any other portion of the Globe? Common sense would be against such an understanding of my words. When it is said of a picture, "This is such a person;" or of a map, "This is such a country;" we mean of course that the person or the country is *represented or shadowed forth* by the picture or the map: and it is according to an analogous principle of interpretation that Protestants would explain the words of the institution.

3rdly. The figurative interpretation *is according to the context*. Mr. Brown has referred to one part of the passage—where it is said, in the account given in Luke xxii., and in 1 Cor. xi., "This *chalice (or cup)* is the New Testament in my blood:" and, in Matthew xxvi. and Mark xiv., "This (that is, *the cup*, which is the antecedent) is my blood of the New Testament:" and what does he say? He tells you *there is a figure here*. He therefore contends that the expression, "This *cup* is the New Testament in my blood," and the corresponding one in Matthew and Mark,

*of course* must be interpreted *figuratively*; but when he comes to the words, “This is my body,” these *of course* must be explained *literally*. This is the most extraordinary and arbitrary scheme of interpretation I ever met with; and I think our friends have exhibited, in their shiftings, perhaps the best description of perpetual motion that has yet been discovered.

I have thus given these three reasons against the literal interpretation of the passage:—FIRST, the disciples’ minds were quite prepared to understand our Lord in a figurative sense, because *the mode of expression he employed was analogous to those modes of speaking, confessedly figurative, which were common among the Jews*. SECONDLY, the mode adopted is quite accordant with the general mode of speaking in all languages; and THIRDLY, the very context supports our interpretation, for there is a figure in the context, as has been acknowledged. Mr. Brown ought not to quarrel with us for interpreting the words “This is my body,” and “This is my blood,” *figuratively*, when he is obliged to confess that the phrase “This cup is the New Testament in my blood” *must* be interpreted *figuratively*.

A passage in the 3rd of Acts was adduced by me, in which St. Peter, speaking of Christ, says, that “*the heavens must receive him till the times of the restitution of all things*.” My Rev. opponent says this does not militate against the Roman Catholic doctrine, if rightly understood; for they do not say that the *natural* body of Christ is present in the Eucharist. What I argue, however, is, that the passage *distinctly proves the absence of Christ in every bodily sense*. I care not whether Mr. Brown speaks of his natural body, or his glorified body, or whatever other body he pleases; my statement is, that, *with regard to his body in every sense*, the text in question remains applicable. If the Scripture declares that *the heavens must receive Christ* (as to his *human nature*, for in his *divine* he is *every where* present) *till the restitution of all things*, then I cannot see on what grounds we can believe that he is present in the Eucharist, in “*all the constituents of a true body*,” as the Tridentine Catechism, already quoted, affirms.

But Mr. Brown thinks that he has discovered a great objection here. He says, if Christ be *in the heavens*, how was it that *Paul saw him*, as mentioned in the 9th of Acts, and as referred to by himself in 1 Cor. xiv. 8.? and he asserts that, if my objection from the 3rd chapter be of any weight, it might as well be urged by infidels on account of the apparent discrepancy between the 3rd and

9th chapters. Perhaps this is one of the most *plausible* objections he could have started, and yet it has no *solidity*, nor is there any room for infidels to establish a discrepancy in this case. The word translated "the heavens" (*οὐρανόν*) means, *not merely* what we attach in common language to the term, but *every thing that surrounds the earth*; and all I want to contend for from this passage is, that Christ's body is *not to be present* ON EARTH until the times of the restitution of all things. It may be in any portion of the heavens Mr. Brown chooses, and he may give it whatever name he pleases; all I am called on to establish is, that Christ's body is to be *absent from earth* till a certain period, yet future; and it remains for Mr. Brown to *prove* that, in the case of St. Paul, *Christ descended on earth*. He might have been seen without being actually on earth; and bear in mind that *this is expressly stated in the case of Stephen*, which has also been cited by my opponent, where it is said (in direct contradiction to his supposition) that he "*saw the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God.*" Acts vii. 55, 56.

There is nothing else of consequence to be answered in what has been advanced on the other side. Three portions of Scripture have been adduced this day in support of Transubstantiation. You have heard the passages from the 6th of John, you have heard the words of the Institution, and also the passages from the 11th chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Answers to these have been given, and difficulties and objections started, and it will be for you to consider on which side the strength of the argument lies.

All that has been hitherto said is, however, little more than *preliminary* to the important subject which has been announced, namely, the SACRIFICE OF THE MASS. There is an awful character in the whole matter. Though we disbelieve and argue against the doctrine of the bodily presence, yet it is not, after all, so much on account of the doctrine *itself* (for, if viewed *simply and alone*, it might be *comparatively* harmless), but *on account of the consequences that are made to result from it*. It is because the *Sacrifice of the Mass* is built upon it; it is because the *worship of the host* is made to follow from it; it is because that, as a matter connected with it, sacrilege is committed with regard to the sacrament *by taking away the cup from the people*. It is on *these* grounds especially, I say, that we contend against Transubstantiation, believing that it opens

the way to what we consider to be alike dishonourable to God and ruinous to man.

I shall, therefore, urge, as a portion of my time still remains, one or two points respecting the Sacrifice of the Mass. Mr. Brown, in his definition of the doctrine held by the Church of Rome, dwelt very much, you will remember, on the fact that the sacrifice of the Mass is a *commemorative* sacrifice, and one instituted for the purpose of *applying* the merits of Christ to the soul of man. Now I do not mean to charge Mr. Brown with actually denying that his Church holds it to be a *propitiatory* sacrifice. He has certainly said that he was misrepresented at the Bath Meeting on this point. I happened to be the individual who, at that meeting, adduced *the Council of Trent's anathema, fulminated against any one who should deny that the Sacrifice of the Mass is truly propitiatory* (see Concil. Trid. Sess. 22. Can. 3. de Sac. Miss.); but I did not use the canon in reference to Mr. Brown individually, but in reference to *any* man who denied the propitiatory nature of that sacrifice. It had been stated previously, that Mr. Brown *had* denied its propitiatory nature. My statement, then, was founded on this, and the sum of what I said was, that if Mr. Brown or any other person chose to make such a denial, *he was opposed to, and under the anathema of, a General Council of his own Church.*

However, he has not *formally* denied the propitiatory nature of the Sacrifice of the Mass this day; but at the same time *he has laid much greater stress* on the fact that the sacrifice is *commemorative*, and was also instituted for the purpose of *applying the merits of Christ* to the soul of man. Let me observe, that it is a most extraordinary way to get out of a difficulty, by saying that the Sacrifice of the Mass was instituted *for the purpose of application*. I am persuaded Mr. Brown will not find a single instance of a sacrifice being instituted for *such* a purpose. The purpose of a sacrifice is *not application to man*, but *oblation to God*. God has appointed his Spirit, and other means subordnately, by which he will *apply* the merits and blood of Christ to the soul of man; but he has never appointed *any literal sacrifice* for that purpose; and it rests with our antagonists to *prove*, and not merely to *assert*, that the Sacrifice of the Mass was instituted with such an intention. I think they will find it difficult to give one text of Scripture to bear them out in their assertion.

Now you will perceive that the Sacrifice of the Mass rests upon the truth of the *bodily presence* of Christ in the

Eucharist, and therefore if we disprove the *latter*, we disprove the *former*. Without, however, viewing the subject in this connection at present, I shall content myself with advancing in this address *one independent argument* to shew that the Sacrifice of the Mass cannot be what the creed of Pope Pius IV. (which every Roman Catholic admits) terms it, namely, "*a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead.*" My argument is, that it cannot be such, BECAUSE IT IS DESTITUTE OF THE ESSENTIALS OF A PROPER AND PROPITIATORY SACRIFICE. There are *certain things which must absolutely exist*, in order to constitute a sacrifice a *proper* and a *propitiatory* one. I contend that *these are wanting* in the Sacrifice of the Mass, and therefore there can be *nothing propitiatory* in *that* sacrifice. I shall consider this lack of essentials in reference to *two particulars*:—

FIRST.—I say that THE DESTRUCTION OF THE VICTIM is necessary to a proper and propitiatory sacrifice. The necessity of this is proved from the 9th chapter of Hebrews and 22nd verse, in which it is declared—"WITHOUT SHEDDING OF BLOOD THERE IS NO REMISSION." From this passage it appears that *the blood-shedding or death of the victim is necessary* in order that a sacrifice be proper and propitiatory. But there is *no such blood-shedding or death in the Sacrifice of the Mass*; for who is said to be the *victim* in that sacrifice? The Council of Trent tells us that,

"Since in this divine Sacrifice, which is performed in the Mass, *the same Christ is contained*, and is *bloodlessly* immolated, who once offered himself bloodily on the cross; the holy Council teaches that this sacrifice is *truly propitiatory*, &c."—*Concil. Trid. Sess. 22, de Sac. Miss.*

Here the Council, while it looks upon the sacrifice as "*truly propitiatory*," yet confesses that Christ is offered *unbloodily* in it; and what says the Scripture of Christ? In the 6th chapter of Romans and the 9th verse we read,

"Knowing that Christ rising again from the dead *dieth now no more*, death shall no more have dominion over him."

Now, if Christ, being raised from the dead, "*dieth no more*," and if he be the supposed victim in the Sacrifice of the Mass, it is manifestly plain that *he does not die* in the offering of that sacrifice. The argument, therefore, stands thus:—

The *blood-shedding, or death, of the victim is necessary*, in order that a sacrifice should be *propitiatory*, as testified in Heb. ix. 22.

There is *no such blood-shedding, or death, of the supposed victim* (i. e. Christ) *in the Mass*, as declared by Romans vi. 9; and admitted in Session 22 of the Council of Trent.

THEREFORE, The Sacrifice of the Mass *cannot be a propitiatory sacrifice.*

AGAIN.—I don't know how our friends on the other side will be pleased, when I endeavour to point out that *another essential thing required* to constitute the Mass a proper and propitiatory sacrifice is no less than A SACRIFICING PRIEST TO OFFER IT. With all due deference to the gentlemen opposite, I beg to state that *there is no such officer under the New Testament dispensation as a sacrificing priest, except Christ himself.* The English term “priest,” may be sometimes used as being a corruption, or contraction, of the term “Presbyter” (Greek, πρεσβυτερος), which means simply an Elder or Minister, and is *quite a different word* from that which would be translated *sacrificing priest.* I contend for the position I have laid down, and I ask for proof that the term *sacrificing priest* (ιερευς) is ever applied to *any single individual*, except Christ, under the New Testament dispensation. But, besides speaking *negatively*, I speak also *positively*; and I call your attention to the 7th chapter of Hebrews, and the 23rd and 24th verses, where you will find a very expressive and remarkable passage. The Apostle says,—

“The others, indeed (i. e. the priests of the Levitical dispensation), were made *many priests*, because *by reason of death* they were not suffered to continue; but this (Jesus) *for that he continueth ever*, HATH AN EVERLASTING PRIESTHOOD.”

Our opponents will recollect what is the original word in the last clause of this passage. The expression is strong enough, if we merely take the words of the Douay Bible, Christ “hath an *everlasting* priesthood;” but the more accurate rendering of the word (απαράβατον) is, he hath a priesthood WHICH CANNOT PASS FROM ONE TO ANOTHER. If, then, Christ has a priesthood which cannot pass from one to another, that is, which is *confined to himself*, I ask, what authority have the clergy of the Church of Rome for the office of sacrificing priests, which they profess to hold? They are intruding into the office which belongs *solely* to Christ, “*because he continueth for ever*,” instead of contenting themselves with the ministerial offices which Christ has *really* appointed. Now if there *be* such an office, as I contend there is *not*, let the gentlemen remember that I *ask for proof*; if proof cannot be adduced, *they are destitute of another essential requisite to make the Mass available as a propitiatory sacrifice.*

The Meeting then adjourned.



FIFTH DAY.—*Thursday, March 6th, 1834.*

---

SUBJECT:  
THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS (*continued.*)

---

THE CHAIRMAN took his seat at the usual hour.

THE REV. T. J. BROWN.

Yesterday, my Christian friends, I invited you to attend to this discussion with calm and dispassionate minds. I beg to repeat to-day the same request; and I repeat it with the more earnestness, because dishonourable attempts have been made to disseminate those prejudices which ought not to accompany any one hither. It is with regret I inform you, that yesterday, after the discussion, tracts were thrown out from one or more carriages, tending to create violent prepossessions against the cause which I advocate; and every person who has a feeling of honour must, at least during the continuance of this discussion, condemn such conduct as highly reprehensible. I hold in my hand one of those tracts which was picked up, entitled, "The Mass Service of the Popish Church proved to be Unscriptural;" and, in p. 7, there are two quotations, said to be from a work written by a Roman Catholic priest, which quotations are entirely false and calumnious. There is nothing in the original to authorise them.

At this solemn time, when we ought to support our cause only by strict argument on each side, I am sorry to observe, that by the Gentlemen opposite, attempts have been made during this latter part of the discussion, as there were during the former part, to create false impressions against us, by appeals to books, and by stories extracted from them, which have nothing to do with the question. I was asked by Mr. Lyons whether I believe in the Breviary. I told him some days ago that my belief in any thing recorded in any part of those narratives or legends from



which I made certain selections, was a mere historical belief; that I, as well as any Protestant, have a right to consider whether they are properly authenticated or not; and if they appear not to be established upon grounds such as should make them deserving of credit, then I, and any Roman Catholic, have a right to throw overboard such narratives.

But Mr. Lyons kept back what this Roman Breviary is, and it becomes of some consequence that I should inform you. The Breviary of the Roman Catholic priest is not made up, as you may perhaps suppose, of legendary tales: it is composed almost exclusively of the Psalms, of portions of the Old and New Testaments, and of the writings of the holy fathers. Mr. L. cannot select more than a few instances of those stories which he represents as ridiculous and impious, and in most instances the historical part consists of very edifying accounts of the saints, whose festivals we commemorate. I must add, that the Roman Breviary, thus constituted, forms a part of the daily office of the Roman Catholic priesthood, and that the Psalms, and portions of the Old and New Testaments which it contains, are chanted in this chapel for about two hours every day.

When I stated the difficulty I laboured under, from the necessity either of passing by unanswered Mr. Tottenham's objections, or of omitting my arguments, Mr. T. said he called for both answer and argument. I beg, however, to tell him, that I stand here the advocate of the Roman Catholic Church; and that not to him am I answerable for the way in which I conduct my case, which is pleaded before the Chairman and you.

I shall here notice very briefly one objection which I overlooked yesterday. Mr. Lyons told you, that I had explained the word *flesh*, in John vi. 63, as meaning *corrupt flesh*. This is among the many misrepresentations that are continually urged against us. The fact is, that I did not explain it as meaning "corrupt flesh;" but I quoted Matt. xvi. 17, to shew you that the word "flesh," in John vi. 63, might signify "the corrupt *reason*" of man, and not "corrupt *flesh*." He tells me, moreover, that if I explain the term "*flesh*" in certain verses of St. John's 6th chapter, of the true flesh of Christ, I am guilty of departing from principle by explaining the same term "flesh" in verse 63, not literally but figuratively. Indeed, I have yet to learn that there may not

occur in the same chapter circumstances which justify, *in one instance* a literal, *and in another* a figurative interpretation of the same word.

Mr. L. termed me “an infallible teacher of an infallible Church.” This is nothing less than an appeal to your prejudices. I hold myself to be personally as liable to error as yourselves. I claim no infallibility, and it is injustice to reproach me with it.

I now proceed to that which I promised to consider this day, namely, the occasion when language is to be explained in a figurative sense, or otherwise. Mr. T. asserted that the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper are to be understood figuratively, since the disciples were prepared so to understand them. Therefore, he contended, there was no danger of error; first, because the figurative meaning was according to the general analogy of the language of holy Scripture, and he illustrated his argument by the figurative expressions, “the rock was Christ,” “Hagar is Mount Sinai.” Secondly, because it was in accordance with the general form of expression in all languages. Thus it is said, *a picture is Mr. N.; a map is Europe.* Thirdly, because it was in conformity with the context; for I had admitted that when Christ said, “This *cup* is the New Testament,” the word *cup* is figurative, and therefore I had no reason to exclude a figure from any other words of the institution. Such are the reasons alleged by Mr. T. for explaining figuratively the words of the institution; and he calls upon me for a regular system of interpreting homogeneous passages. I will tell him briefly and at once, that language may be employed figuratively, *when, in so doing, there is no ordinary danger of mistake; but, when there is such danger, it is not lawful to employ figurative language.* Now, in the present instance, had figurative language been used by Christ, there was great danger of mistake; in fact, if the words spoken by Christ were intended not to be understood *literally*, they *have been mistaken from the earliest times*, as I may a little later have occasion to shew. In order, however, to afford you more satisfaction on this, which I know is considered a strong point by Protestants in opposition to Catholic belief, I will state my views a little more at length respecting the use of figurative language.

In the first place, it is highly dangerous on the part of Mr. T. to explain the portion in question of the sacred text figuratively; for it puts weapons into the hands of the

infidel which he will not be able to wrest from him. The Socinian has the same reason for explaining figuratively the words whereby Christ declares that he is the Son of God, as Mr. T. has for explaining figuratively the language of Christ in the Eucharist.

In the second place, figurative language is divided into two classes—figures of words, and figures of thought. To the former class only can be referred the manner of expression used by Jesus Christ at the institution of “the Lord’s Supper:” by some of our opponents it is said to belong to *metaphor*, by others to *metonymy*. Metaphor originates in a comparison mentally instituted between the subjects of two different propositions, which have some real or imaginary resemblance; whence the subject of one proposition is substituted for the attribute of the other. Thus, a crafty man may be called a serpent, a bold man a lion, and in Luke xiii. 32, Christ terms Herod a fox. It will be useful for me to make here a few observations concerning metaphors, as owing to a mistake about their lawful use, it has been often urged against us (though not yesterday), that as Christ calls himself, metaphorically, *a door, a vine, &c.*, so he *metaphorically* calls *the bread his body*. The rules of metaphor which I think it proper now to propose are two;—first, that the subject, chosen for the attribute of a different proposition, ought to express *more clearly* the qualities of that to which it is applied; and, secondly, that it must not be *particular* but *general*. Thus, in the metaphorical expressions with which the words of the institution of the Sacrament are usually classed, “I am the true vine,” “I am the door.” 1st. a vine and a door exhibit *more strikingly* certain qualities of Christ with reference to his disciples and his Church. 2ndly. in these instances the metaphorical term is not *particular*, but *general*. Christ does not say, I am *this* door, I am *this* vine; but generally, I am *the* door, I am *the* vine. Accordingly, between those expressions and the words of the institution of the Sacrament there is the widest difference. You will observe, that there is no parallel between them, as to the *form* in which they are expressed. Christ, in the former instances, says, “I am the door,” “I am the true vine;” but he does not say, “*my body* is the bread,” but “*this* is my body.” The difference between these two manners of expression is very important. For, first, to say, “this (bread) is my body,” is a violation of the first rule of metaphors, according to

which the attribute should represent, in a manner more striking and more clear, the subject it is brought to illustrate. Now, though a vine and a door do express more clearly and strikingly the qualities and properties of Christ, yet the *body* of Christ does not express more clearly and strikingly the qualities and properties of *bread*. In the 2nd place, Christ does not say this bread is *a* body; yet if he meant to speak metaphorically, and he did not so express himself, he would have violated the second rule of metaphors, that the attribute should be expressed in a *general*, not in a *particular* sense. He does not, therefore, say as in the metaphors which are objected to us, "I am *the* vine," "I am *the* door;"—he does not say, "this is *a* body," but, "this is *my* body." You comprehend, I trust, these differences. In the former expressions it is said, in a general manner, "I am the door," not "I am *this particular* door," &c. for such a metaphor would not be tolerated. I now pass on to that which was actually urged against us yesterday as a strong objection, from an alleged resemblance of the language used by Christ to that figure of speech called "the metonymy."

The metonymy is a rhetorical trope, meaning that one word is employed *as a sign* for another. Upon the alleged use of this figure by Christ in the institution of the Eucharist, is founded the common solution, given by Protestants, to our argument from his words on that occasion. This solution is not indeed of very commendable origin. We are informed by Hospinian, in the second part of his "*Historia Sacramentaria*," p. 26, by Fulke, in his "treatise against the defence of the censure," p. 249, and others, that Zuinglius, after having wasted five years in vainly opposing the real presence, was looking out in Scripture for some *figurative expression, similar* to the words of the institution used by Christ, when, as he himself writes, shortly before the 13th of April, and while he was lying in bed, a figure, or spectre, presented itself before him, whether white or black, he says, he knew not, (I should pronounce black, to judge from the weakness of the argument which it suggested), and addressed him thus:—"How can you hesitate so long? You may find a parallel expression in the 12th of Exodus, verse 11, where it is said of the paschal lamb, that "it is the Lord's pass-over." Thus did an evil spirit first suggest this example of a figurative expression, as corresponding with the words of the institution, "this is my body." My Protes-

tant friends may wish to hear how we answer it, and I will endeavour to satisfy them.

We must admit some rule whereby to determine when a sign may be employed for the thing signified. I call your attention therefore to the following observation, which is of great importance. All figurative language is founded in the supposition that we have, at least *a partial acquaintance* with what is passing in the minds of others. On the one hand, indeed, if we could *know intuitively* the thoughts of those with whom we wish to converse, there would be little need of language at all; if, on the other, we had *no knowledge* of what is passing in their minds, we should not be allowed to make any use of figurative language, but must on every occasion express ourselves literally and clearly. We have, however, a certain *imperfect acquaintance* with what passes in the minds of those to whom we address ourselves; and this is the foundation of the use of figurative speech.

First, therefore, figurative language is allowed, when the sign is *known* to have a *natural* and obvious resemblance with the thing signified; such a natural and obvious resemblance as exists between a picture or a statue and the person or object it represents; between a map and the country which it is intended to figure. Here, then, is a solution to one of Mr. T.'s grand difficulties. When a person asks what is that picture, that statue, that map, in such a case it is evident that *he does not intend* to question me about *their substance*, but that he asks what does the picture, the statue, or the map, *represent*; and hence, in such cases, my answers, that the picture or statue is Mr. N., that the map is Europe, are *naturally* understood in a figurative sense, and not according to the literal meaning of my words. Thus the partial knowledge we have of each other's ideas directs us, in our mutual intercourse, to avoid obscurity or mistake.

Secondly, we are allowed to employ a sign for the thing signified when there is known to be a *conventional resemblance* between two subjects, founded upon the common understanding and agreement of mankind. Thus, it is generally understood, that *a branch of laurel*, in particular circumstances, denotes *peace*—that *a letter*, written on *black-edged paper*, and sealed with *black wax*, intimates, in many cases, *death*; and judging from those circumstances that I shall be understood, I may sometimes say, looking at the laurel, “*here is peace*,” and looking at the letter, “*this letter contains death*. There is no danger of

error in regard to the use of figures on such occasions. But there would be danger of error by employing those figurative expressions in a country where there did not exist such a conventional agreement; so that were I to say of a branch of laurel "this is peace," *where it was not understood* that laurel should be a *sign* of peace, I should be guilty of a great absurdity.

Thirdly, the use of the sign for the thing signified is allowed, when there is a sufficient *warning* given that we are going to speak in figures. Accordingly, in the exposition of *dreams*, and in the propounding of *parables*, it is allowable to use figurative language, because, on such occasions, there is no danger of error whatever. Hence arises the solution of many examples brought against us; as the exposition of Pharaoh's dream by Joseph, and Nebuchadnezzar's dream by Daniel, when the kings asked for an *interpretation* of the figurative signs.

The fourth and last case, in which we are allowed to use the sign for the thing signified, is when, after having used figurative language, wherein there is no obvious or conventional resemblance, you *explain* that you spoke in figure. But this is not often to be indulged in; for generally speaking it would be, at least, *absurd*. Thus, if I were to point to a leaning tree and say abruptly, "there is the tower of Pisa," my meaning would be unintelligible, and the hearer would be astonished; but I might remove the difficulty if I added immediately, "mind I am speaking in figure; I mean it is a *sign* of the tower of Pisa, for it recalls it to my mind." Except on these occasions, it is not allowed to employ the sign for the thing signified; that is, unless there is an *obvious* or a *conventional* resemblance, or some *previous* notice be given that we speak in figure, or we *afterwards* express ourselves to that effect.

Let us now apply these observations to the question at issue. In the words of the institution Christ, taking into his hands bread, and the cup, declares, "This is my body;" "This is my blood." First, there was no *natural* resemblance between the *body of Christ* and *bread*, or *his blood* and *wine*. It is only *after* the institution of the Lord's Supper that any such could be suspected. 2ndly. There had been no *conventional* resemblance; for had such existed, *bread* would *commonly* have been substituted, in ordinary discourse, for *the body of Christ*, and *wine* for *his blood*; but men have not yet agreed among themselves to speak thus, still less was it agreed upon at the time of the institution



of the Lord's Supper. 3rdly. Christ did not declare, beforehand, that he *intended* to speak in figure; nor, 4thly, did he declare afterwards that he *had spoken* figuratively. Therefore, I contend, there is a dangerous precedent, a forging of weapons for infidels, by maintaining that, in the instance before us, the language of Christ is to be understood not literally, but figuratively; for there is nothing in revelation which cannot be explained away as merely figurative language, if, in this instance, you are allowed to say, that the language of our heavenly Teacher is figurative.

I must now beg to resume, for a moment, the reflections concerning the institution of the Lord's Supper, which I was unable to bring to a conclusion before my last time for addressing you had expired. Having proved that where there was danger of mistake, on matters of far less moment, the Evangelists failed not to caution their readers against falling into it; and having observed that, if Christ had so willed, he *might* have left his followers *substantially* his body and blood; and, that *he could not have used words more expressive* of such an intention, than those of the institution, "This is my body," "This is my blood," I proceeded to consider the subject-matter of the institution. Upon this I had remarked, that Christ was propounding a *doctrine of faith*; and that on such an occasion, so great is the natural tendency among men to error, he could not be too literal in his language. 2ndly. That he was instituting *a sacrament*, as Protestants acknowledge; therefore the meaning of his words should be clear and obvious, as otherwise there was danger of our not being benefited by his institution, of which there was so much probability that the object would be perverted. 3rdly. He issued *a commandment*; "Do this (said Christ) in remembrance of me." Hence it was necessary that the meaning of what they were to do should be manifest. 4thly. He leaves to his followers *a testament*; "This cup is the new testament in my blood." Therefore, lest disputes and dissensions should arise concerning its meaning, it was of the highest importance that the language which conveys it should be plain and literal. Accordingly, it has been so understood at all times, from the first ages of Christianity.

Lastly, the *time* of the institution should be considered. It was when Christ was about to leave his disciples—the very night in which he was going to enter upon his bloody passion. He was immediately afterwards to be taken



from them, and his death was now about to atone for the sins of men. Under such awful circumstances this was not a time for figurative language, *such especially as might be easily mistaken*. Certain figures of speech may, indeed, be allowed under all circumstances *when there is an obvious or conventional resemblance* — as when Christ spoke of the *cup*, signifying its *contents*, and with regard to which there could be no mistake; but greatly alarming to faith must be the consequence if, on the occasion we are speaking of, Christ meant his language at the institution to be taken *figuratively*, whereas he used words than which none could be *more clearly expressive of a literal meaning*; “This is my body,” “This is my blood.” I trust that by this time you are satisfied of the failure of yesterday’s objections against the literal meaning of Christ’s words; that although figures of speech may be *on certain occasions* employed, yet that the words of the institution were not such, because they were spoken *under circumstances when figures could not have been allowed*. If other objections shall be brought forward on this matter, I will meet them, if time shall permit, in a bold and straightforward manner.

I find, upon reflection, that before I proceed farther, I ought to notice one or two difficulties objected to me by Mr. Tottenham. How, asks the Rev. Gentleman, can we tell that the words of Christ are in the Bible, except by the testimony of the senses?—He shows, also, that the testimony of the senses is repeatedly appealed to in the Holy Scriptures;—and hence he argues that we Catholics unreasonably reject the testimony of our senses, on the subject of Transubstantiation. But I beg to remind Mr. T., or rather those who may be ignorant of it, that, strictly speaking, the proper object of our senses is *not the substance* of matter, but *its qualities merely*. We know nothing whatever of the essences of things through the senses, which cannot bear testimony to any more than external appearances. It is, however, according to the *physical order* of creation, that where there are outward appearances, there is also a corresponding substance, which we must, consequently, upon such testimony of the senses, and relying on *physical* certitude, *generally presume to exist*. But *physical* certitude is always subject to the exceptions of the Almighty Author of the physical world. Hence, the question to be submitted is, not whether in that or this particular case it is possible for the senses to be deceived, in associating with external qualities, their *ordinary* sub-

stances ; for, that it is possible to be so deceived, no one who believes as he ought to do in the power of the Almighty can call in doubt : but the question before us is, whether, *in this particular instance* of the Lord's Supper, God, who is all powerful, has deviated from the ordinary laws of physics. We contend that he has so deviated, and that the objection borrowed from the senses, should stand in this case for nothing. The fact, however, is, that *all* the senses *are not deceived*, for there is one sense not so liable to be misled, in this matter, as the others which are applied to external appearances—*the sense of hearing* ; and this bears testimony to the infallible declaration of Christ, that he gives us truly and substantially his body and blood. St. Thomas, as has been argued, had the testimony of sense :—yet Christ said, “ Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.” Does not St. Paul also teach, in Heb. xi. 1. that “ Faith is the evidence of things not seen ? ”

Mr. Tottenham maintained that there was no parity between the incomprehensibility of Transubstantiation, and of the mystery of the Trinity. I will not dwell upon proving such parity ; I will not give the infidel the advantage which he might have by it. The Socinian knows, however, that there is a parity, and so does the Unitarian. Mr. T., or any one acquainted with the works of Spinoza, or Socinus, or Crellius, must be aware that they use that same species of objections against the Trinity, which Mr. Lyons brought against the mystery of Transubstantiation ; although I know not if I ought to allow him much credit, since he did not urge even these as he might have done.—I am now prepared to continue my arguments.

I stated at the outset that I should be able to establish the Catholic doctrine by the testimony of Scripture only. Mr. Tottenham observed, that he was desirous of confining the controversy to Scripture ; but what is done by him and his friend ? Instead of restricting themselves to the *written word of God*, they call in the evidence of the *senses*, they appeal to the suggestions of reason ; and although the finite powers and intellect of man are not able to penetrate the mysteries of God, and form a judgment thereon, yet they taunt me with objections which they collect from sense and reason. As *they* have thus departed from Scripture, *I* am not bound by the method which I may have laid down for myself. If Mr. T. has

recourse to the senses and to reason, I may surely illustrate the meaning of Scripture, by an authority which Protestants themselves acknowledge to be of the highest value in expounding the written word,—the belief of Christian antiquity. I will read to you, on this subject, the sentiments of Leslie, in his “Dissertation concerning Ecclesiastical History,” prefixed to “Parker’s Abridgment of Eusebius,” p. 2 and 3—

“In ecclesiastical history and *there only*, I may say, *is the decision of all controverted points in divinity*, either as to doctrine or discipline. For every one of them must be determined by matter of fact. It is not refinings, and criticisms, and *our* notions of things, but what that faith was which *at the first was delivered to the Saints*. This is matter of fact, and was determined by evidence. And where any text of the New Testament is disputed, the best evidence is from those Fathers of the Church, who lived in the Apostolical age, and learned the faith from the mouths of the Apostles themselves, such as St. Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, &c. These must best know the sense and meaning of the words delivered by the Apostles. And next to them, *they to whom they did deliver the same, and so on through the several ages of the Church to this day*. And those doctrines and that government of the Church, which has this evidence, must be the truth. And they who refuse to be determined by this rule, are justly to be suspected, nay, they give evidence against themselves, that they are departed from the truth.”

Thus writes a Protestant in commendation of primitive authority. The same Leslie, in p. 182, says—

“There is a tradition, which (for the evidence of it) we are willing to admit, that is according to the rule of Vincentius Lirinensis, *quod semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*, that which was always received, every where, and by all.”

One other authority I shall quote from a vast collection which I have before me, that of Dr. Marshal, in his “Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church,” pages 24, 25.

“I can little conceive, that the Christians who lived so near the time of the Apostles, as Irenæus and Justin did, should choose to depart from the model they had received from the Apostles of Christ.—In a thing so material as this was, it is utterly indeed incredible, that there should be a departure from an Apostolical usage, the reason of which was then as much in force as ever; and yet that no noise should be made of it, nor any clue be given to lead us into the precise æra or occasion of the change. If this be once allowed as fairly supposable, there will be an end of proving any ancient practice.”

Accordingly at the last week’s discussion, I showed you that *Protestants* are indebted for many points of doctrine to *tradition*, and that they are not able to support them *by other evidence*. Now tradition, regarding the subject under discussion, is manifestly in favour of the Catholic doctrine. If Mr. Tottenham may think proper to bring against my faith any objections from the Fathers, I shall be able to satisfy you that those objections are, every one, brought from works wherein the Fathers, without any prejudice against their holding the Catholic faith, *ought to have been ob-*

scure : on the contrary, I can produce a multitude of testimonies in support of our belief from other works of the Fathers, *wherein they were bound*, in the exposition which they were giving of Christian Faith, *to be most explicit*. Amongst the books from which my evidence will be adduced, are their Catechetical discourses. Twice a year, namely, at the Vigils of Easter, and Pentecost, the Catechumens were solemnly baptized, after which they were permitted for the first time to remain in the assemblies of the faithful during *the whole* of the instructions, and of the service ; for previously, when the solemn rites were about to be commenced, the Catechumens were dismissed, (as we are informed by primitive writers) because the Christian pastors were unwilling to communicate to them the mysteries that then were celebrated. But, after they were brought out of the waters of regeneration, they were conducted in white robes before the Bishop, who expounded to them, for the first time, the doctrines of the primitive Church, with regard to the manner of Christ's presence in the Eucharist. Then it was that he ought to have been most clear and most explicit.—As he was now unfolding the mysteries of faith to those who for a long period had been eagerly looking forward to that hour of unreserved communication, the Bishop would naturally deliver to them, *in the most perspicuous terms*, the belief which he had received from the Apostles. What, then, is the language which he employed ? Nothing can be more indisputable in support of Catholic doctrine. I call your attention to St. Ambrose, Archbishop of Milan, in his book of Instructions addressed to the New Christians (*de Initian- dis*, Tom. 2, cap. 9, p. 338, 339, Ed. Paris, 1690)

“ I entreat you, who are soon to become partakers of the sacred mysteries, seriously to consider which is the more excellent, the nourishment given by God to the Israelites in the desert, and called the bread of angels, or the flesh of Jesus Christ, which is the *very body* of him who is life itself: the manna which fell from heaven, or that which is above the heavens. . . . . Water flowed from out of the rock in favour of the Jews, but for you, *it is blood that flows from Christ himself*. . . . . Thus, this meat and drink of the old law, were but figures and shadows : but here we speak of the truth and the validity. And if the shadows so much excited your admiration, how truly noble must be the substance. For light is preferable to the shadow : truth to the figure : the body of Christ to the manna of heaven. But you may say, I see somewhat else ; how do you assert that I shall receive the body of Christ ?—This remains to be proved. How many examples may we not make use of to show that we have *here, not what nature formed*, but what the divine blessing has consecrated, and that the virtue of this blessing is more powerful than that of nature : because *by it NATURE ITSELF IS CHANGED* ? Moses held the rod : he cast it on the ground : and it became a serpent—again, he took it by the tail, and again it became a rod . . . . . *If now the blessing of men was power-*

*ful enough to CHANGE NATURE, what must we not say of the divine consecration, when the very words of our Lord operate? For the sacrament which you receive, is accomplished by the words of Christ. Now, if the word of Elias could call down fire from heaven, shall not the word of Christ BE ABLE TO CHANGE THE NATURE of created things.*

“ You have read concerning the creation of the world : He spoke, and it was done : He commanded, and it was formed. If, then, the word of Christ could draw out of nothing what till then had no existence, *shall it not be able to CHANGE the things that exist INTO WHAT THEY WERE NOT BEFORE?* For it is not a less effect of power, to give new existence to things, than to CHANGE THE NATURE of things that previously existed. We will now establish the truth of this mystery, from the example itself of the incarnation. Was the order of nature followed, when Jesus was born of a virgin? Plainly, not. Then why is that order to be looked for here. It was the true flesh of Christ which was crucified, which was buried ; and this is truly the sacrament of his flesh. Our Lord himself proclaims: *This is my body.* Before the benediction given by the celestial words, it is called bread ; but after the consecration, the body of Christ is signified. He said also, *This is my blood.* Before consecration, it has another name, and after consecration it is denominated blood. And you answer *Amen* ; that is, *it is true.* What the mouth speaks, let the internal sense confess : what the words intimate, let the affections feel. By these sacraments Christ feeds his Church, and by them is the soul strengthened. *It is a mystery you should carefully keep to yourselves . . . . . lest you communicate it to the unworthy, and publish the SECRET before unbelievers,* by an unrestrained freedom of speech. You must guard your faith with the utmost vigilance, that you may preserve the purity of your life, *and the secret of the mystery, with inviolable fidelity.*”

I invite your attention next to an extract from a discourse of St. Cyril, Patriarch of Jerusalem, which he, in like manner, delivered to the Neophytes, that is, to those who were newly baptized, under those solemn circumstances of which I lately reminded you. I quote from the 4th Mystagogical Discourse, p. 292, &c. Oxford edition—

“ As Jesus Christ, speaking of the bread, declared and said, ‘ this is my body,’ *who shall ever dare to call his word in question?* And as speaking of the wine, he positively assured us and said, ‘ this is my blood,’ *who shall doubt it and say, that it is not his blood.* Once, in Cana of Galilee, he changed water into wine by his will alone, and shall we think it less worthy of credit, that he CHANGED WINE INTO HIS BLOOD? Invited to an earthly marriage, he wrought this miracle ; and shall we hesitate to confess that he has given to his children his body to eat and his blood to drink? Wherefore, with all confidence, let us take the body and blood of Christ. For under the type or figure of bread, his body is given to them, and under the figure of wine, his blood is given ; that so being made partakers of the body and blood of Christ, you may become one body and one blood with them. . . . . Wherefore, I conjure you, my brethren, not to consider them any more as common bread and wine, since they are the body and blood of Jesus Christ, according to his words : and *although your sense might suggest that to you, let faith confirm you.— Judge not of the thing by your taste, but by faith assure yourself, without the least doubt, that you are honoured with the body and blood of Christ. This knowing, and of this being assured, that what appears to you bread, is not bread, but the body of Christ, although the taste judges it to be bread ; and that the wine which you see, and which has the taste of wine, is not wine, but the blood of Christ.*”

Now let us be taunted with absurdity ! Now let it be said that our mysteries are incomprehensible ! We allow that reason and the senses do not, for they cannot, bear

testimony to the substantial presence of Christ in the Sacrament; but we have the higher testimony of Jesus Christ manifested by the belief of the primitive Christians, upon which Protestants rely for some of their doctrines of faith. *We have the same faith as the primitive Church.* Away, then, with talking of absurdity. Believing with the primitive Church, we cannot be in error about the doctrines taught by the Apostles.

---

THE REV. E. TOTTENHAM.

MR. CHAIRMAN, as to the fact which Mr. Brown stated at the opening of his address, namely, that tracts had been thrown out of the windows of certain carriages on leaving this place yesterday, I have only to say that *this is the first intelligence I have had of the matter*; and while I thus assure him of my total ignorance, I may be permitted to add, in justice to him, that I perfectly agree in most of the observations which he has made on this subject. I cannot of course speak as to the nature of the tract in question, not being acquainted with it; but I hesitate not to express it, as my decided opinion, that, *at such a particular juncture*, tracts, on either side, should not be thus distributed.

However, I am not equally disposed to give up the next point to which my Reverend opponent adverted, and which concerned that very troublesome book, THE BREVIARY. He says attempts have been made by us to create false impressions, by appealing to books and stories which have nothing to do with the question. I *protest* against the assertion that the Breviary was referred to *for the purpose of creating false impressions*. It was *supposed*, at least, that the extracts, which had been cited from it, *had a great deal to do with the question*. We were mistaken, to be sure, in Mr. Brown's judgment; but, at all events, I trust he will believe our declaration that there was *no intention* to create false impressions, but rather to support our argument, by appealing to the book.

But Mr. Brown has been pleased to dwell on this book. He tells us that, if the stories that appear in it are not founded on historical grounds, and sufficiently authenticated, *any Roman Catholic may reject them!* I am not quite so clear, however, that this would accord with the requirements of the Council of Trent, which gave its *sanction* to



the Breviary, as I told you on a former day. We are informed also by Mr. Brown that the book is not made up of absurd legendary fables; but is almost exclusively composed of the Psalms, of portions of the New Testament, and of the writings of the Fathers, and that it contains some very edifying accounts of certain circumstances. There is, doubtless, a considerable amount of Scripture and of the writings of the Fathers in it, but with respect to other parts, I can only leave the meeting to judge for themselves, *how very edifying* are the specimens to which we have listened.

My adversary seems not at all pleased that I should have attempted to prescribe to him a certain course of proceeding; and he says that he is not answerable to me for the manner in which he conducts his case. Certainly I do not pretend to *prescribe* to Mr. Brown what course he should adopt, nor do I hold him answerable *to me personally*; but, advocating what I believe to be important truth, I think I have the privilege of every disputant, namely, to call upon my adversary both to *prove his point*, and to *answer my objections*.

It has been intimated to us, that it is highly dangerous to explain away the words of the Institution in a figurative manner; for that we put, by these means, weapons into the hands of the Infidel and Socinian, as they might, with equal justice, explain away the passages which assert that Christ is the Son of God. Now, Sir, I ask, in sober seriousness, *who*, during the course of this discussion, *has really put weapons into the hands of the Infidel and the Socinian?* Surely, if you recollect the discussion on the "Rule of Faith," it was not the speakers on the *Protestant* side that did so. But, if we were to examine the different passages which prove the Son-ship of Jesus, and those which the Roman Catholic alleges, from the words of the Institution, in proof of Transubstantiation, we should find *no such parallel between them* as would countenance the idea that the Socinian may as justly explain the former figuratively. In the *one* case the expressions are direct and palpable, and the context unconnected with figure; but in the *other* case the matter is quite different, for there is figurative language confessedly in the context, and the figurative interpretation is, as I have before shown, accordant with the whole analogy of Scripture language.

Mr. Brown has argued considerably on what appears to him the *necessity* of the case, and, after laying down as the rule for *literal* or *figurative* interpretation "*when there*



is ordinary danger of mistake, or when there is not," he tells us that Christ *would not have used figurative language* at such a time as this—just before his passion—when he was instituting a Sacrament and giving a commandment—and when there was *great danger* that his words should be *mistaken*, if he intended to speak figuratively. I confess, Sir, I am anxious to hasten to the point *which seems to be well nigh avoided on the other side*, I mean, the sacrifice of the Mass; and therefore, without stopping now to inquire what sort of language it would have *become* Christ to have used, or to examine into Mr. Brown's rule for literal or figurative interpretation, I shall content myself with simply referring you to my observations yesterday, in which I endeavoured to show that *there was no ordinary danger* of the disciples mistaking Christ's words, inasmuch as they were quite prepared, from circumstances which I mentioned, to receive the passage *figuratively*.

We have had a long disquisition on *metaphor* and *metonymy*. As much important matter presses upon me, and as I have already (sufficiently, I trust, for my cause) discussed the words of the institution, I do not mean to follow Mr. Brown in all his disquisition; and perhaps I may *claim* this privilege, as he said that he should not follow me in my arguments, except where he thought proper. However, I rather think Mr. Brown has failed to establish the point which he laboured to prove. He says there is a difference between the expressions, "I *am* a door," "I *am* a vine," and so forth, and "this *is* my body." Now, let us bring the matter to a point. Take the single text, for example, that was quoted from the Old Testament yesterday, "This (*i. e. the hair*) is Jerusalem,"—take, in connection with that, the expression, "This (*i. e. the bread*) is my body,"—and if these be not *homogeneous* passages, that is, passages *of a precisely similar nature*, I am sure there are none in the Bible at all. Now, if Mr. Brown is *of necessity compelled* to interpret "this is Jerusalem" *figuratively*, I ask, upon what system of fair and *consistent* interpretation, does he take "this is my body" *literally*?

The Reverend gentleman has told us that some have found great difficulty in discovering figurative expressions similar to the words of the institution; and, by way of showing that the Protestant solution of those words is "not of very commendable origin," he has treated us with a story about Zuinglius, learning something upon this point from *a spectre* that appeared to him, which Mr.

Brown supposes to have been *black*. Will the Reverend gentleman excuse my remarking that, if he objects so strongly to the stories of the Breviary as adduced by us, it was not exactly *consistent in him* to adduce stories of this kind relative to Zuinglius, especially when, in *this case really*, they have nothing to say to the question. However, be that as it may, methinks that what was said to be revealed to Zuinglius, (whether by *black* or *white* figure, or by *no* figure at all) is *very much in point*. "This (*i. e.* the Paschal Lamb) is the Lord's passover." How does Mr. Brown explain that? I suppose figuratively; therefore, to be *consistent*, he is certainly called upon to explain the words of the institution *figuratively also*.

I shall here notice the observations of my antagonist respecting *the senses*, which he made in connection with *my former remarks* on the subject. He says that the question is not whether there is a *possibility* that the senses may be deceived; because, if we believe in the power of God, this is quite possible; but the question is, *whether, in this case, God has deviated from his ordinary plan, and has willed that the senses should be deceived*. Mr. Brown adds, "we contend that he *has* so deviated." And yet what does he say in the next breath? Why, though he starts with declaring that he thinks God has deviated from his usual way *in willing that the senses should be deceived* in this matter, he tells us in the very next sentence, that the senses are *not all* deceived, for that we have the sense of *hearing*, by which we discover the clear declarations of Christ. In reference to these statements several questions might be proposed, but I am satisfied with asking, as I did before, *how does he know that he hears those words correctly?* Surely, *on his principle*, he is just as likely to be deceived with regard to the sense of *hearing*, (even supposing that to be apparently in his favour, which we deny), as I am with regard to the *other* senses when exercised on the elements in the Eucharist.

We have been reminded that Christ said to Thomas, "Blessed are they that have *not seen* and yet have *believed*;" and even so, following the example of Christ, would I say also: Blessed are those who, without visible demonstration, believe *upon sufficient testimony*, such as Thomas had. This too, I apprehend, is the meaning of the Apostle, when he says in the other passage quoted, "Faith is the *evidence* (or *persuasion*) of *things not seen*." But then I do not think either our Lord or his Apostle ever said "Blessed are they that believe *contrary to what they see*;" and really if a man believe Transubstantiation,

he not only believes what he has *not* seen, but he believes *contrary* to what he *has* seen.

On this subject of the senses, two or three extracts from the Fathers have been given. Without *unduly* depreciating their testimony, I may remark that *at least* (and this Mr. Brown has himself testified) *they are not infallible*; and therefore, however they may be received as *witnesses to matters of fact*, they cannot be invested with *positive authority*, by which we must *necessarily* be bound. At all events, in order to countervail the extracts which have been given on the opposite side, I shall read one short quotation from Tertullian, which will show that our argument *from the senses* is not so untenable, or so unknown to the doctors of antiquity, as Mr. Brown would imply. He writes thus:—

“ WE MUST NOT CALL OUR SENSES IN QUESTION, *lest we should doubt respecting their fidelity even in the case of CHRIST HIMSELF*. Because, if we question the fidelity of our senses, we might peradventure be led to say, that Christ *delusively beheld* Satan precipitated from Heaven; or *delusively heard* the voice of his Father testifying of him; or was *deceived when he touched* Peter's mother-in-law; or *smelt a different odour* of the ointment which he received for his sepulture; or *tasted a different flavour* of the wine which he consecrated in memory of his own blood.”—Tertull. de Anim. in Cap. de quinque sens. Oper. p. 653.

Such is the testimony of Tertullian, distinctly advocating *an appeal to the senses* just as we have done; and I think that he argued very well, for, if we are to question the evidence of our senses with regard to matters upon which they can exercise themselves, *then we have no certain proof of the existence of any material thing*. I cannot know that there is a meeting in this room at present. I cannot tell that this is a book which I hold in my hand. In short, to deny the validity of the testimony of the senses, *respecting things on which they can be exercised*, (except when we have positive proof that God *willed* them to be deceived in a particular instance; or when they *appear to contradict* each other, which will sometimes occur, *not from the free exercise of them*, but from the application of some *external power* to cause a deception, and in which case they are *first to be reconciled* by the best methods of correction) to deny this, I say, *lays*, as I before remarked, *the foundation of universal scepticism, whether in matters that are religious, or in matters that are not*.

My opponent fastened on an observation which I made yesterday, when, in my first reply, I hailed the declaration of his intention to keep almost altogether *to the Scriptures*:

and now he thinks he has caught both Mr. Lyons and me, for he declares, that, instead of keeping exclusively to the Scripture, we went to the evidence furnished *by the senses, and by reason*, and thus quitted the ground we professed at first to stand on. Now, Sir, *we did not depart from the principle on which we started*: for, whenever we appealed to the evidence furnished by reason, or by the senses, *we grounded that evidence on the evidence of Scripture*. You will remember my observations yesterday as to *the extent* to which arguments from reason should be carried, and *the place* which they should occupy; and, on this principle, I endeavoured to act throughout. I supported, therefore, one of the arguments *from reason*, which my friend adduced, with a text of Scripture, taken from the 24th chapter of Luke, and the 6th verse, where it is said of our Lord by the angels, in the account of his resurrection, “He is *not here, but is risen* :” implying, that his body could not be *in two places at the same time*. Therefore, the argument was not derived from reason *merely*, but from reason *founded on, and sanctioned by, the testimony of Scripture*. In like manner, an argument was brought *from the senses* against transubstantiation; but was it an argument *apart from Scripture*? It was *not*; and Mr. Brown took good care not to notice any of the proofs which I adduced from Scripture, to authorise an appeal to the senses, where those senses could be brought into legitimate exercise. I referred to the statement so often made in the New Testament, that, when the Apostles would prove the resurrection of Christ, so far as *the fact* of it was concerned, it was *by an appeal to the senses*. I quoted from the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, and the 15th chapter, where the truth of his resurrection was proved simply and solely from the fact, that, after his death and burial, he was “*seen by Cephas*”—then “*by the eleven*”—then “*seen by more than five hundred brethren at once*”—after that, “*seen by James*, then by all the Apostles;”—and last of all, “*seen by Paul also, as one born out of due time*.” I also called your attention to the opening of the first Epistle of John, where, not merely the evidence of *sight*, but likewise of *touch*, and of *hearing*, were referred to with respect to the incarnation of our Lord. Thus, you see, *we have not departed from our principle*, but, rather, in using the arguments to which Mr. Brown objected, we have gone precisely *according to the testimony of the ORACLES OF GOD*.

Mr. Brown thinks, that, because, in his judgment, we

abandoned our principle, *he* may depart from mere Scripture testimony; and he has, consequently, referred us to primitive antiquity. He has alluded, if I mistake not, to what was called the *Discipline of the Secret*. At the present period of the Discussion (especially after what I have just now noticed) I am not going to occupy my time by dwelling much upon this subject. I would remark, nevertheless, in passing, that, though my adversary quoted a passage from St. Cyril of Jerusalem (which, I admit, is rather strong, at first view, but which may be very satisfactorily explained), yet it is a positive fact, that Cyril, in his Catechetical and Mystagogical Lectures, referred not to the *bodily presence* of Christ in the Eucharist, as being the secret, but, while there were *several* subjects on which secrecy was observed, he alludes *specially* to the Mystery of the *Trinity*. I have a passage at hand, which is much to the purpose, and which I can produce, if called upon.

Apart from the testimony of Cyril of Jerusalem, many proofs, more general in their nature, might be adduced on this subject. However, before I leave it for the present, I shall refer only to one of a *negative* kind, which seems to me to establish, not merely that the *bodily presence* of Christ in the Eucharist could not have been *the grand secret* of the ancient Christian mysteries, but that the doctrine could not have been *at all held* in the primitive Church. I allude to the *negative evidence derived from the manner in which the Pagans ridiculed the doctrines of Christianity* in the early ages of the Church. I shall confine myself particularly to the conduct of the apostate EMPEROR JULIAN, because his case is more striking, perhaps, than that of any other Pagan, and not open to the objections which might be started (whether with force, or otherwise, I do not say) against other developements of this argument. Here we have the case of the Roman Emperor Julian. He had been, be it remembered, *a baptized, professing Christian*; and, as such, had been introduced and *initiated into all the mysteries*. Now, after his apostacy, he wrote largely against Christianity. In his writings he ridiculed the doctrine of the Trinity; the doctrine of the Incarnation; in short, all the grand doctrines of Revelation; but *never, in a single instance, does he ridicule the subject of Christ's bodily presence in the Eucharist, or transubstantiation, although such a doctrine, of all others, if it did exist, was most open to ridicule*. This is a *fact*; and it has been admitted by Husenbeth, in his controversy with

Faber, who, when the point was stated by the latter, took the trouble to read Julian's works, in order to ascertain the truth upon the subject. Here, then, is the *negative evidence* of this illustrious Pagan; and, it seems to me impossible to conceive how, while Julian is incessant in his ridicule with regard to the different doctrines of Revelation, TRANSUBSTANTIATION should not, *in a single instance*, have come in for a share of his ridicule, *had it existed* as a doctrine of the early Church, or as *the grand secret* of ancient mysteries.

Now, Sir, I am determined, so far as *I* am concerned, that we shall bring this discussion *more to a point*. You will recollect that the subject, which was announced for examination, was the SACRIFICE OF THE MASS. Mr. Brown commenced by saying very justly, that it was necessary for him to prove *the real and bodily presence* of Christ in the Eucharist, *before* he could prove *that he was offered up as a real victim* in the sacrifice of the Mass. In consequence of that, we have entered so far into the discussion of the doctrine of Transubstantiation. But, Sir, *we must not avoid the main question*, to which the investigation of Transubstantiation (or the *change of the substance* of bread and wine into "the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Jesus Christ") is but *preliminary*. I therefore intend to go now more fully into that which constitutes *the main question*; and I do so the more readily, because, even were I to give the gentlemen on the other side the benefit of all their reasoning yesterday and to-day, and *admit fully* the doctrine of Transubstantiation, *I should still contend* most strenuously against the *Sacrifice of the Mass*. The state of the case is precisely this. It does not follow that, even if Roman Catholics *prove the bodily presence* of Christ in the Eucharist, they prove *of necessity* the truth of the doctrine which affirms that *he is offered up as a victim by his priests in the Sacrifice of the Mass*. To establish this *latter* point, they must produce arguments *additional* to those upon which they build Transubstantiation. But, on the other hand, it *does* follow that, *if we disprove the bodily presence* of Christ, we disprove *at once*, without any more lengthened investigation, *the propitiatory nature of the Sacrifice of the Mass*; for, if Christ be *not present in a bodily sense*, he *cannot be offered as a real victim* in the Mass.

This being the state of the case, I might be content with *simply disproving Transubstantiation*, and letting the



*building* (i. e. *the Mass*) tumble of itself when *the foundation* is thus removed ; or, I might even grant *Transubstantiation*, and still contend against *the Mass*. However, as I have given a considerable time to the *former* subject, *I shall now engage myself more particularly with that of the SACRIFICE OF THE MASS*, which, as I have said, is *the main question to be debated*, and upon which I just entered at the close of my last speech yesterday.

At different periods of the discussion on Transubstantiation this subject was hinted at. Something was given in the way of *definition* as to the doctrine of the Church of Rome respecting it. As I have already commented on Mr. Brown's definitions, and matters connected therewith, near the close of my last address yesterday, I shall merely repeat one or two of the definitions given in the authentic documents of the Church of Rome herself, that those not then present may know what we are about. The Creed of Pope Pius IV. (received by every Roman Catholic) makes this declaration :—

“ I profess likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a *true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead.*”

Observe here, that, in the Church of Rome, the sacrifice of the Mass is regarded *not merely as a commemorative sacrifice, not merely as a sacrifice of application* (which I showed you, in the speech before referred to, was quite untenable) but likewise (as I there also intimated) that it is held *mainly as “ a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead.”* Moreover, one of the canons of the Council of Trent, speaking to the same effect, pronounces the following anathema :—

“ If any one shall say that the Sacrifice of the Mass is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice made upon the cross, and that it is not *propitiatory*, or that it profits only the receiver, and that it ought not to be offered for the *living and the dead, for their sins, pains, satisfactions, and other wants*, LET HIM BE ACCURSED.”—Concil. Trid. Sess. 22. Can. 3. de Sac. Miss.

THIS being the doctrine, as promulgated, *not by an individual, but by the CHURCH OF ROME HERSELF*, I shall now resume my arguments *against* it, leaving the arguments *in favour of it* to be adduced by our opponents, and afterwards to be replied to by us.

I adverted briefly to this point towards the conclusion of yesterday's proceedings. I then produced ONE GENERAL ARGUMENT against the Sacrifice of the Mass, which was branched out *into two particulars*. The argument was founded on the fact THAT THE MASS WAS DESTITUTE OF



THE ESSENTIALS OF A PROPER AND PROPITIATORY SACRIFICE. The *two particular essentials* which I then noticed, and of which I maintained the Mass to be destitute, were, first, *the destruction of the victim*; and secondly, *a sacrificing priest to offer it*. I challenged our antagonists to prove from Scripture that there is any such officer, under the New Testament dispensation, as *a sacrificing priest*, except the Lord Jesus Christ himself. This argument need not, however, be repeated, as *a reference back to it* will suffice.

Pursuing then my reasoning against the Mass, I come now to a species of *negative* argument, the purport of which is, that *there is a total silence respecting it in those parts of Scripture where (if there were to be such a continued sacrifice under the New Testament dispensation) we might most reasonably expect to find it*. I advance this by way of *negative* argument, and I shall come presently to abundant argument of a more *positive* kind. I shall take *three cases* from the New Testament in which this most strikingly appears.

I. *The commission given to the Apostles*. This is declared in the 28th chapter of Matthew 19th and 20th verses:—

“Going therefore teach all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.”

Here was a commission given to the Apostles, to go and teach all nations, and to administer sacraments; but there is not the slightest, not the most distant, reference to anything like *the offering of a continued literal sacrifice* as being a part of their duty. The celebration of the Mass is not merely *a distinguishing employment*, but perhaps *the chief one*, of the Roman Catholic priesthood. Now *if* the celebration of the Mass *were intended* to be the chief, or one of the chief, official employment, of the ministers of the gospel under the New Testament dispensation, it may well strike us as extraordinary that, when a commission was given to the first preachers of the gospel, *there should not have been the most distant reference to any thing like such a sacrifice*.

II. I take another case from *the Epistles to Timothy and Titus*. In these Epistles the Apostle Paul gives them directions *as to what they should do in the Church*. He mentions in the 2nd chapter of 1st Timothy the duty with regard to *prayer* for all men. In the 3rd chapter and

elsewhere, *the duties that devolved on Bishops and Deacons*. In the 4th chapter and the 13th verse, he directs Timothy to “attend to *reading, to exhortation, and to doctrine* ;” and in the 4th of 2nd Timothy, to “*preach the word* :” to be “instant in season and out of season.” Many other passages might be cited, in which various directions are addressed to these two ministers, “*that they might know how they ought to behave themselves in the Church of God*”—(see 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15.) directions *which include the grand distinguishing parts of Christian worship, and the duties of Bishops and ordinary ministers* ; and I ask, if these epistles were written for the *express and avowed purpose* of directing Timothy and Titus how they should behave, and act in the Church, and in conformity with the office which they bore, is it to be supposed that—if the celebration of the Mass was to be their *chief*, or one of their chief concerns—there should not be the most distant reference to it in the three epistles?

III. Let me notice another instance, from the Acts of the Apostles, *relative to the assembling of the Primitive Christians for worship, and to their proceedings in general* ; and here we find the same silence. In the 2nd chapter of Acts and the 42nd verse, the Disciples are said to have continued “in the *doctrine* of the Apostles, and in the *communication of the breaking of bread, and in prayers*.” In the 6th chapter, when a murmuring arose respecting the Greek widows, the Apostles said, “we will give ourselves continually to *prayer* and to the *ministry of the word*.” Again, in the 20th chapter and 7th verse, we read that “on the first day of the week, *when we were assembled to break bread, Paul discoursed with them*.” Other passages also might be mentioned, to show that, in the account of the assembly of the Primitive Christians for worship, and of their proceedings generally, there is a reference to the offering up of *prayer*—to the *sacraments*—to *preaching*—to those things which constitute the *chief parts* of divine service ; but there is a total silence relative to anything like a sacrifice being offered up, which was to be (as the Mass professes to be) a “*proper and propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead*.”

I have thus taken these three remarkable cases :—1st. *The commission to the Apostles*. 2ndly. *The letters written to Timothy and Titus* for the purpose of instructing them as to their duty in the Church ; and, 3rdly. The evidence furnished by the account given of *the assembling of the*

*Primitive Christians for worship, and of their general proceedings, in the Acts of the Apostles.* It will not do for our friends on the other side to reply "Such an argument *proves too much*, for many *other* things, which we mutually practise, are omitted, and this argument would thus throw over-board *other* points, as well as *that* against which it is now directed." 'Tis true there may not be, in the cases I have adduced, a reference to some other points which, however they may be useful and important and *not contrary* to the Bible, are yet not *of the essence* of Christian worship; but the force of my argument rests upon the fact, that while (especially if we take the three cases *together*) *all the grand peculiarities of Christian worship and ministerial duty* are noticed, not a syllable is expressed regarding the *sacrifice of the Mass*, although *that* is (upon Roman Catholic principles) *the most striking peculiarity of Christian worship, and its celebration one of the chief concerns of the priesthood.*

Let me now adduce a few passages from the Epistle to the Hebrews, which will enable me to follow up the foregoing *negative* argument with others of a more *positive* and *direct* kind. The 23rd and 24th verses of the 7th chapter I quoted at the close of yesterday's discussion, and on them I need not dwell farther. But let me pass on to the 26th and following verses:—

"It was fitting that we should have such an high priest (*i. e.* Jesus) holy, innocent, and undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens: *who needeth not daily*, as the other priests (*i. e.* the priests of the old law) to offer sacrifices first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for this he did *once*, in offering himself."

In this passage two things, bearing upon the subject in hand, are stated with regard to the offering of Christ—*first*, the simple fact that *it needed no repetition*, as the sacrifices of the Jewish dispensation did; and, *secondly*, the reason of this, namely, that there was a *sufficient* sacrifice for sin in his *one* offering,—“for,” the Apostle adds, “*this he did ONCE*, in offering himself.” This text, therefore, distinctly proves that Christ was to be offered *but once*; and I say that the explanation which has been given by the Church of Rome, for the purpose of getting out of the difficulty in which she is placed by such passages, has been very artful, when she affirms that the Mass is a *continuation*, and not a *repetition*, of the sacrifice on the cross. Without entering into the particulars of this distinction, I simply leave it to the judgment of the meeting to decide, whether or not, when the Scripture affirms *the absolute*

*perfection of Christ's one offering*, and when the inspired writers so frequently state, as one of the distinguishing differences between the offering of Christ, and of the Jewish priests, that *his* was to be *once*, whilst *theirs* were *many times*, there is room left for supposing, with respect to his sacrifice, the idea of continuation or repetition, or any thing of the kind?

I call your attention further to the 9th chapter of this same Epistle, the 11th and 12th verses:—

“ Christ, being come an high priest of the good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hand, that is, not of this creation: neither by the blood of goats, or of calves, but by his own blood, entered *once* into the Holies, having obtained *eternal redemption*.”

There the same fact is repeated which was asserted in the foregoing quotation, that Christ “ entered *once*” into the Holy of Holies (*i. e.* into Heaven); and then what is added? the great and glorious truth that he has obtained *eternal redemption*. Now take a man in whatever section of the globe you please, and let him be reduced to the lowest state of degradation by his sin, and *what can he possibly want BEYOND ETERNAL REDEMPTION?* and such a blessing, we are assured, is obtained *by the work of Christ*, and by his *one* entrance, with “ *his own blood*,” into the Holy of Holies, to present it before the mercy-seat of God. Oh! then, my friends, trust in the perfection of this *one* offering which has obtained “ eternal redemption,” instead of depending, in *any* degree (how small soever that may be) on the supposed efficacy of the Mass, or of any thing else, for your everlasting peace.

Allow me here to remind you of the use I yesterday made of the 22d verse of this chapter—“ *Without shedding of blood there is no remission*”—to overthrow the propitiatory nature of the Sacrifice of the Mass. Although the verse comes before us now in order, yet, having already spoken on it at the time mentioned, it is unnecessary to repeat what has been said. I merely *refer back*, therefore, to the latter part of yesterday's discussion for its application, and now proceed onward to the examination of the 24th and two following verses of the same chapter:

“ For Jesus is not entered into the Holies made with hand, the patterns of the true: but into heaven itself, that he may appear now in the presence of God for us. Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the Holies every year with the blood of others: for *then* he ought to have suffered often from the beginning of the world: but now *once* at the end of ages, he hath appeared for the destruction of sin, by the sacrifice of himself.”

Observe here, 1st., the expression in the 25th verse,

where it is said of Christ, "*Nor yet that he should offer himself often.*" I care not whether our friends opposite talk of the *repetition* of his sacrifice, or the *continuation* of it, for this text is decidedly against *either the one or the other*.

2ndly. Mark how St. Paul lays down the principle, that a *proper offering* of Christ involves his *actual suffering*. "*Nor yet that he should offer himself often - - - for then he ought to have suffered often* from the beginning of the world." Such is the statement of the Apostle, and such the connection which he establishes; and his affirmation therefore, which constitutes one of the premises of my argument, is, that *Christ cannot be properly offered without actually suffering*. But Christ *does not actually suffer in the Mass*. This will not be affirmed on the other side; and, even if it were, Scripture would prove the contrary, as I have shewn by Romans vi. 9, near the close of my last speech yesterday. The conclusion, therefore, is, that Christ *is not properly offered in the Mass*; and, if Christ be not properly offered in the Mass, *then the Mass cannot be "a proper and propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead."*

3rdly. Bear in mind that the striking expression "*once*" is again used in the 26th verse—"But now *once* at the end of ages, he hath appeared for the destruction of sin, by the sacrifice of himself." It certainly is very remarkable, that the Apostle should dwell so positively upon the fact of Christ's *one* offering, and that he should so continually reiterate the assertion that he was "*once offered*"—hath "*appeared once for the destruction of sin*"—"entered *once* into the Holies, having obtained eternal redemption"—offered "*one sacrifice for sin*"—"by *one* oblation hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified," and so on in many other cases. All this reiteration of similar phraseology has some particular design in it, and overthrows the pretensions of any sacrifice that professes to be "*proper and propitiatory*," except the "*ONE sacrifice*" which CHRIST himself "*once offered*."

4thly. I would only notice further the expression in the 26th verse, that Christ hath appeared "*for the destruction of sin* by the sacrifice of himself." This is the reading of the Douay, or Roman Catholic, version, and it is stronger than the Protestant translation; and I ask, if Christ hath appeared *for the destruction of sin* by the sacrifice of himself, where is the necessity for any *other* sacrifice, professing to

be a proper and propitiatory one, or for a repetition or continuation of *the same*, to which we are to look in any respect? There is no ground for it; but more than this, the very fact of the professed existence of such a sacrifice *practically*, if not professedly, *denies* (as we shall see presently) the perfection and efficacy of that one sacrifice which Christ presented unto God for sinners.

Now let us take the 27th and 28th verses of the same chapter:—

“As it is appointed unto men *once* to die, and, after this, the judgment: so also Christ was *offered once* to exhaust the sins of many; the second time he shall appear without sin, to them that expect him, unto salvation.”

This is an important passage; but without dwelling on the strong expressions employed, which *repeat* what I have already more than once asserted, I shall beg you merely to observe the parallel drawn here between a man *dying once* and Christ being *offered once*. “As it is appointed unto men *once* to die—so Christ was *once offered*,” and until our friends on the other side can prove that a man can *die more than once*, I do not think they can prove that Christ is to be *offered more than once*; and then what becomes of the Sacrifice of the Mass?

I proceed to the opening of the 10th chapter:—

“For the law having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things: by the self-same sacrifices, which they offer *continually* every year, can never make the comers thereunto perfect: for then they would have *ceased to be offered*; because the worshippers once cleansed should have no conscience of sin any longer.”

What is the argument of the Apostle in this place? It is that *the repetition or continuation of a sacrifice argues its imperfection*; and the converse he also states, namely, that a *perfect sacrifice ceases to be offered, i. e. is not to be continued or repeated*. He declares that the sacrifices under the Levitical dispensation could “never make the comers thereunto perfect, for *then* (i. e. if they could do so) they would have *ceased to be offered*.” But the *very fact* of their *constant offering* proved that they could *not* make the comers thereunto perfect, that is, proved *their own imperfection*. Now, the legitimate *deduction* from this argument, viewed in connection with the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Mass, is—*first*, that the Sacrifice of the Mass, professing to be “proper and propitiatory,” and a *continuation* at least, if not a *repetition*, of the Sacrifice of the Cross, *practically argues the imperfection of the Sacrifice of the Cross*; and, *secondly*, that the Sacrifice of the Mass,



professing to be a *continued* sacrifice, *practically* argues its own *imperfection*.

The *first* deduction contains *doctrine positively false*, for Christ “by *one* oblation hath *perfected for ever* them that are sanctified.” But, as it is *legitimately drawn* from the premises, the falsehood must be traced home *to the premises*; and as *one* of those is the argument of the inspired Apostle, the falsehood must rest on the *other*—and this, truly, is not very favourable to the pretensions of the Mass.

The *second* deduction, (drawn from premises which consist of the Apostle's argument and the admitted doctrine of the Church of Rome,) *flatly asserts the imperfection of the Mass*, and tells, therefore, much against its claims to be “*propitiatory for the sins of the living and the dead*.”

---

THE REV. F. EDGEWORTH.

WE have been again and again reprov'd by the Rev. gentleman, who has just sat down, for not coming at once to the point, which he regards as the principal point in this discussion; namely, the Catholic doctrine, respecting the Sacrifice of the Mass. We must claim for ourselves the privilege of pursuing our own course in propounding this doctrine to the assembly, and in giving the multitude of proofs which surround us, that this doctrine is not the invention of man,—that it is delivered in the Holy Scriptures, and that it has been received by the illustrious Christians of all ages, in the sense in which the Catholic Church propounds it at this day.

Mr. Tottenham tells us he does not regard the doctrine of Transubstantiation as the main subject of our discussion; but yet he reminds us of the importance of our clearly proving, in the first place, that the bread and wine are, by a divine power, changed into the body and blood of Christ; because, he says, if he upset the dogma of Transubstantiation, then, without any further trouble, he may take his leave of the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass. To this I cordially assent; and there-



fore I shall occupy the time of the meeting with other proofs than those already adduced, that the doctrine of Transubstantiation is to be found in Holy Scripture.

If Mr. Tottenham cannot find a proof of this doctrine in Holy Writ, at least the preponderance in number, talent, and virtue of the Christians in every age have found it there. It is true, Mr. Tottenham expounds the sacred volume in one way, and his Catholic opponents in another; you, therefore, have before you the painful spectacle of men, equally reverencing the inspired word of God, equally impressed with the truth that if we depart from that word in faith, or in practice, we endanger, in proportion to that departure, the welfare of our immortal souls; on both sides, we appeal to the Holy Scriptures; you hear us, on our part, solemnly averring that in the Scriptures there is the plainest, incontrovertible evidence that the Redeemer of the world has provided nourishment for all his followers, in a mysterious manner, giving us, under the appearance of bread and wine, his own precious body and blood—his true and real body—not indeed after the carnal manner which is ascribed to us over and over again, but his own *real, though spiritualized* body; yet not spiritualized as our opponents would have it—so as to exclude the reality of his bodily presence; you behold the Catholics of the world appealing to Scripture for incontrovertible evidence, that this doctrine is the doctrine of Christ: on the other hand, you have the Rev. Mr. Tottenham and Mr. Lyons, and others, occupied in describing our faith on this point as credulity, deserving of almost unqualified scorn and contempt. Perhaps it is due to Mr. Tottenham to draw a distinction between him and the Rev. Mr. Lyons; but, in making that distinction, I could not refrain from saying things which would be painful to individuals present; feeling what I might justly do, I yet desist.

But, Christian friends, how stands the discussion? You have before you persons of equal sincerity, equally possessed of natural gifts, equally claiming the advantages of education, and long study of the Scriptures; yet, concerning the salvation of mankind, we utterly disagree in our interpretation of the sacred volume. Do you not feel that it would be most interesting to you to know, in what sense, the earliest Christians—the first-fruits of the labours of the Apostles of Christ—understood the important words, the meaning of which we are now discussing? Yes, my

Christian friends, I am sure you feel that it is most desirable that you should obtain that assistance which such information will afford you, in discovering the real meaning of the words of Christ. It would not be altogether irrelevant to remind the meeting of what I expect Mr. Tottenham will not remind you, that some of the leading men at the time of the first Reformation, the standard-bearers of that unfortunate change, were not able to convince themselves, and did not dare to endeavour to convince their followers, that Christ is not present in the holy Eucharist. Although Mr. Tottenham has relied upon Julian's silence respecting the doctrine of Transubstantiation as negative evidence, that it was not a doctrine entertained in Julian's time, and has thus sought assistance from the conduct of one whom he calls an "illustrious Pagan,"—I apprehend he will not take you to Luther, another illustrious personage. Mr. Tottenham who went so far for a negative argument, has left it to us to adduce a positive and more than a countervailing one from Luther himself. To which of the two will Mr. Tottenham adhere—*Julian* or *Luther*? Be that as it may, we have it in writing from Luther, that he would have felt infinitely obliged to Carlostadius, or any other who would have persuaded him, (Luther,) that in the holy Eucharist there was nothing but bread and wine—not from his love of truth, but hatred to the head of the Church; but Luther confessed himself overwhelmed by the clear words of Christ—

"*This is my body ; this is my blood.*"—Epist. ad Argent. Tom VII.

Luther was unable, with all his eagerness to innovate, to deny the force of words so clearly showing the presence of Christ in the holy Eucharist. Mr. Tottenham will not presume to say again that we are not aware of the difference between the doctrine of Consubstantiation and Transubstantiation, which he imputed to Mr. Brown the other day; but if we do not dwell upon the distinction here it is, because it is not to our present purpose. All I would have you remember of Luther on this matter is, that he was not less disposed to revile the Catholic Church, than the apostate Julian (I will not call him "an illustrious Pagan") was disposed to attack the Church of Christ; but Luther, with all his disposition to overturn the Catholic Church, could not prevail upon himself to deny the presence of Christ in the holy Eucharist. I will quote one more Protestant authority before I proceed to

infinitely more respectable authority, (which I am sure every Christian will feel,) founded on the writings of the early Christians. Melancthon, who was distinguished among those who introduced changes in religion about 300 years ago, and was termed by his followers the phoenix of his age, thus writes to Œcolampadius upon the subject of the Catholic doctrine of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist—

“Not only have I reflected upon what may be said on both sides, but also I have examined the doctrine of the ancient Fathers on this matter. After this full inquiry into all that appears most conclusive on either side, forgive my saying that I do not approve of your sentiment; for I find no strong reason that can satisfy my conscience in departing from the strict meaning of Christ's words.”—In *Epist. Zuinglii et Œcol.* L. 3—p. 603. Bas. 1592.

I produce this evidence to show that Protestants who lived in a time of great turbulence, and who evinced by a long series of actions the most determined spirit of opposition to the Catholic Church, that such men as Luther and Melancthon were not able to persuade themselves, without the most manifest violation of the written word of God, to deny the presence of Christ in the holy Eucharist. But perhaps, my Christian friends, you feel little or no respect for any thing that may be found in the writings of Luther, or any of those who laboured with him to produce the changes of religion that distinguished our history 300 years ago. It is not my desire to impress you with a feeling of respect for anything which such men wrote or did; for it is to their crime of raising themselves up against the authority of God's Church, that we are to trace the unhappy divisions that now exist amongst us. Had it not been for these men, all of us here assembled, might now have been worshipping God with one heart and one soul, and professing but one faith as we profess to believe in *one* Lord, and have been regenerated in the waters of *one* baptism.

Let me ask your attention now, Christian friends, to a testimony for which, I am persuaded, you will feel infinitely greater respect. You have before you the fact that, whilst the gentlemen opposite and ourselves appeal to the written word of God, we cannot come to one and the same interpretation of the passages, which we mutually feel to be of great practical consequence; and the painful alternative, as Mr. Tottenham insisted most correctly yesterday, is either that we are guilty of idolatry if we are wrong in our belief that Christ is present in the Eucharist; or, if we are right, Mr. Tottenham is himself guilty of the crime

of denying, and leading others to deny to Jesus Christ, that homage which is due to him, from those who know his divine character, in the holy Eucharist, because they see him not, thus forget, as it seems to us, the admonition given by our Saviour to the incredulous Thomas: "Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed." I am sure, indeed, that if the Rev. gentleman opposite believed with me, that in the holy Eucharist there is the real body and blood of Christ, that there is Christ himself as he is now at the right hand of the Eternal Father in the kingdom of heaven; if, I say, he believed that doctrine as I believe it, he would not for one moment hesitate to fall down before the Eucharist, as I fall down, to pay that supreme adoration which is due to Jesus Christ. But it is our misfortune to differ in the interpretation of the passage of Scripture which relates to this important doctrine. Let us then go to those Christians who were in immediate communication with the Apostles, and I ask your attention to documents, the authenticity of which Mr. Tottenham is too well informed and too well disposed to dispute.

In the first place, I call your attention to a letter, which is extant, which was written by St. Ignatius, the Martyr. It may be well to tell the meeting some circumstances concerning St. Ignatius. He succeeded St. Peter in the see of Antioch. You may judge from his being selected to succeed this great Apostle, that he was a man of at least some sanctity, that he was sufficiently instructed in the doctrines of Jesus Christ, that he was a man who fully understood those passages of the sacred writings, the meaning of which is now the subject of discussion. This same St. Ignatius, after labouring many years as an Apostle, after performing all the functions of a Bishop, was sent by the Emperor Trajan to Rome to be put to death for his faith; and it pleased God to raise him to the dignity of martyrdom, in the year 107 of the Christian era. With these circumstances in your minds, you must be desirous to know what he believed and taught concerning the holy Eucharist. In his journey to Rome, when he was within what he deemed a few days of his glorious death, he wrote a letter, a copy of which I now have in my hand, edited by a learned Protestant (R. Russell, 1747.) He addressed it to the Christians of Smyrna, and reminds them that he had the happiness of seeing the Lord Jesus after his resurrection from the dead. He

professes his belief in his divinity ; he warns them against innovations upon the truth, for it seems that even then, there were those who ventured to put forth their own conceits and crudities in the place of the revelations of God, asking men to adopt them ; even at that early period, there were some who denied the humanity of Jesus Christ. Using their private judgment, (but I do not contend that they used it with the disposition of our Reverend opponents,) as the only guide necessary to lead to the discovery of the truth, they thought it derogatory to the Supreme Being, to say that He had truly taken upon Himself human nature,—that He had really suffered ; they maintained that He had done these two things only in *appearance*. St. Ignatius speaks in terms of horror of these persons, and observes that, amongst the consequences of their errors, they—

“ Abstained from the Eucharist, because they did not acknowledge that the Eucharist is *the flesh* of Jesus Christ which suffered for us, and which the Father in his goodness raised from the dead. Thus by their opposition to this gift of God, their inquiries end in destruction.”—διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστιαν σαρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὴν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῇ Χρηστοτητι ὁ πατήρ ἤγειρεν.

My Christian friends, is not this evidence that St. Ignatius of Antioch believed that the Eucharist is the *flesh* of Jesus Christ,—not *the figure* of it merely, as is contended by our opponents, but *the flesh* of Jesus Christ, *which suffered for the sins of men*. Surely it was not merely a figure which was nailed to the cross, as the Gnostics maintained, but that flesh which the Father raised up from the grave. Here you have testimony for which you will feel respect. If it does not come with the convincing power of a text of Holy Scripture, it is at least authority to which, under your doubts and in our debates how the Scripture is to be interpreted on this subject, you may wisely have recourse to assist you to discover the truth.

The same blessed Ignatius the Martyr wrote an epistle to the Christians at Rome, on an occasion which must awaken a deep interest in the breasts of us all. At a very advanced period of life, after forty years of apostolic labours, he was journeying to Rome by order of the Emperor Trajan, to be sacrificed for his attachment to the faith of Christ. In this epistle, he entreats his Brethren of the faith not to interpose their prayers that his life may be prolonged ; he is anxious to shed his blood—he had long laboured in the ministry, and such was his attachment to his Lord and Saviour, that like another great

apostle and minister of Christ, his earnest desire was "*to be dissolved*," that he might for ever be united to him whom he so much loved. Then he tells them—

"*I take no delight in the pleasures of this life ; I long for the bread of God, the heavenly bread, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ the Son of God, who is at length born to us of the race of David and Abraham ;—and the drink of God—I long for his blood, which is incorruptible love and eternal life.*"—Ἀρτον Θεοῦ θελω, ἄρτον οὐρανιον, αρτονζωῆς, ὅς ἐστιν σαρξ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υιοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ γενομενοῦ ἐν υστεσῶ ἐκ σπερματος Δαβιδ καὶ Ἀβρααμ· καὶ πωμα Θεοῦ θελω το αἷμα αὐτοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἀγάπη ἀφθαρτος καὶ αενναος ζοη.

In the hands of his guards, and on his journey, he could not celebrate nor receive the Eucharistic mystery of the altar. Yet mark his ardent desire to partake of food which would enable him to live for ever. And what terms does he employ? Say, is this the language of a Catholic,—or a Protestant? We delight to use it. But would the Rev. gentlemen opposite employ it, in speaking of Christ in the Eucharist? Unhappily they would not. Yet it is the language of an illustrious martyr of the early Church, one who had been a disciple of the apostle St. John, and the immediate successor of St. Peter in the see of Antioch ;—in fine, it is the language of one who could remember having seen the Lord himself after his resurrection. My Protestant friends, you will bear in mind that the blessed Ignatius suffered his glorious martyrdom, as early as the year 107.

I proceed now to give you the testimony of St. Irenæus who was a disciple of St. Polycarp :—Polycarp was the Bishop of Smyrna, by the appointment of the Apostle John: he governed that portion of the Church for seventy years, and terminated his earthly career by martyrdom. It was this St. Polycarp that instructed Irenæus in the Christian religion; and St. Irenæus declares he had the instructions of St. Polycarp written "*in his heart, not on paper.*" I do not bring this forward with a view to insinuate that he had not rendered himself familiar with such of the sacred writings as were in his possession, but to shew his attachment to the doctrines which he had received from his predecessor, and the purity of the channel through which those doctrines have been transmitted to us. The truths he had received from Polycarp were "*written in his heart.*" Let us then look in our disputes, with appropriate feelings of respect, to St. Irenæus who died in the year 202. We find in relation to the doctrines which we are now discussing, in his fifth book against heresies, chapter 11th, (I have by me the Oxford edition, which the gentleman opposite or any of his friends may consult,) the following words :—



“Certain heretics,” he says, “in denying the resurrection of our bodies in a state of incorruption, virtually maintain that the Lord did not redeem us with his blood ; *that the cup of the Eucharist is not the participation of his blood, nor the bread which we break, the participation of his body.*”

Again, he asserts that—

“*The Eucharist is the body and blood of Christ ; and that our bodies, nourished by that Eucharist, then laid in the earth and dissolved in it, shall in due time rise again.*”

Again, in book the 4th, chapter 34, we find him triumphantly asking certain heretics who denied that Christ is—

“The Son—the Word—the Creator of the world, how *they* could prove *that the bread over which the words of thanksgiving have been pronounced, is the body of their Lord, and the cup of his blood.*”

He is adverting to errors the exact nature of which I could more fully explain ; but it is not necessary on the present occasion. I have quoted these passages which show, incidentally but powerfully, that *our* faith respecting the Eucharist then prevailed ; it was not denied by heretics, who yet denied other important truths of the Christian religion. But I may bring a charge against our Rev. friends opposite, of refusing to admit what even these heretics, against whom St. Irenæus writes, are found to have admitted ; for they deny that, when they communicate to you *the Sacrament*, as it is generally termed by Protestants, they communicate to you the real body and blood of Christ.

I ask your attention now, Christian friends, to the testimony of St. Justin who suffered martyrdom in 163 or 167. In a work which he addressed to Antoninus, a Pagan Emperor, with the view of conciliating the persecutors of the Christian religion, he expounds, as far as he can, consistently with the *secrecy* observed at that period by Christians,—a point of discipline which you will more fully understand, before this discussion terminates,—he expounds such and so much of the Christian doctrines as would lessen the rage of the Pagans, and put an end to the cruel persecutions which every where followed those who embraced the religion of Christ. He addressed the Emperor thus :—

“Our prayers being finished (it is a graphic narration of the public Christian devotions of every day,) we embrace one another with the kiss of peace. Then to him who presides over the brethren is presented bread, and wine tempered with water ;” (just, my Protestant friends, as Catholics do at this day in the Sacrifice of the Mass) “having received which, he gives glory to the Father of all things in the name of the Son and the Holy Ghost. These



offices being duly performed, &c., the ministers whom we call deacons, distribute to each of the assembly a share of the sanctified bread, and the wine, and the water."

Recollect he was writing to a Pagan, who could form no idea of the substance which lay concealed under the appearance of the bread and wine. St. Justin adds:—

"This food we call the Eucharist; of which only they are permitted to take, who believe the doctrines which we teach, and who have been regenerated by water for the remission of sin, and who live as Christ ordained. We do not take these gifts as common bread and common drink; *but as Jesus Christ our Saviour, made man by the word of God, took flesh and blood for our salvation,—so, we have been taught.*"

Mark these words, my Protestant friends, *we have been taught that the food which has been blessed by the prayers of the words which he spoke, and by which our blood and flesh, in the change, are nourished,* IS THE FLESH AND BLOOD OF THAT JESUS INCARNATE. Catholics at this day are taught the same doctrine—that the Eucharistic food is the flesh and blood of the Saviour, who became man and died for us; but, my dear friends, this is not the doctrine believed and preached by our Rev. opponents. This doctrine is not taught to Protestants as it was to St. Justin, and the early Christians.

I deeply regret it, because this is a doctrine involving the condition of all of us on the other side of the grave. Let me then express my heartfelt grief that this doctrine is rejected by most of you, who now listen to me; not that I presume to charge you with crime in this ignorance of an important Gospel truth; it is only the Almighty who is to judge the secrets of all hearts. But these are occasions, my Protestant brethren, which the Almighty, I am persuaded, whatever men may have had to do in bringing them about, designs as opportunities for removing baneful ignorance on a most important Christian doctrine,—ignorance, of which you have been unconscious, and for which hitherto you may not have been responsible, the culpability of which I ascribe not to your immediate parents; but it lies at the door of your progenitors who fell from the Unity of Faith. It is amongst the fatal fruits of that hardened, that desperate course, pursued by such men as Luther and others, who presumed to innovate upon the truths that had been handed down from the days of the Apostles.

I might here draw your attention, or rather the attention of the Rev. gentlemen opposite, to the mangling, the wilful mangling of these texts which I have adduced from

the writings of St. Justin, found in a work entitled the *Anatomy of the Mass*; but if I were to convict the gentleman who is the author of this outrage, Mr. Shanks, or any gentleman opposite, it would not serve any general or public purpose, and perhaps it would only distract your attention from the clear and forcible fact, that St. Justin testifies that the Christians in his day believed the Eucharist to be the *real flesh* and the *real blood* of Jesus incarnate. Such authorities as I have now referred to, superabound. Few of you can have had an opportunity of possessing or studying the writings of the early Christians; but, be assured that they are records which deserve greater respect than you have been taught to pay to them. As, however, time hastens, I am content, for the present, to pass on to the testimony of Theodoret, a Christian Bishop, and writer, who flourished about the year 431. He is the author of three dialogues against the Eutychians, wherein the speakers are called Orthodoxus, and Eranistes. There are none present who deny the human nature of Christ; it is not, therefore, to establish the truth of Christ being really man, that I make the following quotation, but to show you, from the doctrine *incidentally* proposed in a discussion carried on upon a different subject, that Christians, in the day of Theodoret, believed what now the Catholic Church believes respecting the Eucharist; that bread and wine are, by the power of God, when the ordained words are pronounced by the ministers of Christ, changed into the body and blood of Christ.

Orthodoxus, the opponent of the Eutychian heresy, says to Eranistes, its advocate:—

“Tell me of what are the mystical symbols offered by the priests, symbolical?—Eranistes. Of the body and blood of the Lord.—Orthodoxus. *Of his true body or not?*—Eranistes. *Of his true body.*—Orthodoxus. Very well; for every image must have its original.—Eranistes. I am glad you have named *the divine mysteries*. What name do you give to the offering which is made before the priest’s invocation?—Orthodoxus. *This must not be told openly; for there may be some present who are not initiated.*”

Let me observe, parenthetically, that there was a something which took place in the devotion of assembled Christians, which was deemed most sacred, *and was not expounded to the world*. But to return to the dialogue. Eranistes says:—

“Then answer me in hidden or obscure terms.—Orthodoxus. We call it an aliment made of certain grains.—Eranistes. And what name do you give to the other symbol?—Orthodoxus. A name that expresses a certain drink.”

You must perceive, my friends, that he meant bread and wine, as the things offered "before the priest's invocation."

"Eranistes. And what are they called after the consecration?—Orthodoxus. The body of Christ and the blood of Christ.—Eranistes. So you believe that you partake of the body and blood of Christ?—Orthodoxus. So I do believe. Eranistes. Then as the symbols of the body and blood of Christ were different before the consecration by the priest, and after that consecration are changed, in the same manner, we (Eutychians) assert that the body of Christ, after his ascension was changed into the divine essence."

His argument in favour of a denial of the human nature of Christ was a bad one, yet you see the course of it, that the Christians of his day regarded that which was put on the Christian altars as bread and wine, before the words of consecration were pronounced by the priests of Christ, but after the consecration as "*the true body and blood of Christ.*" This, I say again, is our doctrine—Catholic doctrine—but it is not the doctrine of the Rev. gentlemen opposite.

I might easily multiply the proofs from the earliest writers; but I shall take opportunities at a later period of this discussion to add similar testimony to that which I have now adduced. I am of opinion, that if you give due attention to that which is already before you, you must come to this conclusion—that the Catholic doctrine of the *real presence* of Christ in the Eucharist—namely, that the bread and wine *are changed* into the body and blood of Christ, is not a doctrine found out yesterday, nor a hundred years, nor a thousand years ago. We have proved that it was the doctrine delivered by Christ, and faithfully handed down by the Apostles, clearly expressed by St. Ignatius the immediate successor of an apostle; clearly taught by St. Irenæus, the disciple of St. Polycarp (St. Polycarp, you will recollect, was the disciple of St. John); clearly testified by St. Justin, the elegant apologist of the Christian religion before the frown and persecution of pagan power; clearly established again in the writings of Theodoret, and from that time handed down to this day, as I could easily shew you, and as is allowed by—I will not as yet say, more candid—but, as far as I can judge at present, by more learned Protestants than our Rev. opponents in this discussion. If the doctrine of Transubstantiation is false doctrine, will the Rev. gentlemen tell me when the truth was manifested to the world? If this is false doctrine which we have expounded to you, how was it that the martyr Ignatius should have fallen into it?

How was it that he should have been permitted to be regarded in after ages as a most distinguished advocate of religion? If this is false doctrine, why was there not a reclamation made by some one, when St. Justin in his apology to Antoninus declared it to be the doctrine of Christians? I feel persuaded that these are questions which though they may be pronounced irrelevant, cannot be replied to in any other way, by the Rev. gentlemen opposite, than by saying that the most distinguished Christians in the first ages, distinguished by their piety, by their learning, by their deaths—for most of them suffered martyrdom for their faith—did believe that which the Catholics now believe; namely, that Christ is present in the Eucharist truly and really—that the bread and wine are changed into his body and blood by his unlimited power. I am unwilling to weaken the impression which I am sure such testimony must make on the minds of all impartial inquirers after truth, by adverting as I could easily do to the mistakes, I trust the involuntary mistakes, into which the Rev. Mr. Tottenham has fallen in attempting to refute the observations I made the last time I addressed the meeting.\* It is of very trivial importance, ultimately at least, whether you understand or misunderstand the Rev. gentleman; but it is of infinite importance that all of us, Christian brethren, should arrive at a clear knowledge of the truth upon the doctrine of the Eucharist. Recollect what is before us. Discard that false liberality which asks “Why discuss this doctrine? why investigate these matters? You will live more at ease and peace, if you will not entertain these inquiries.” Repudiate, I repeat it, that false liberality. As the gentleman opposite has said, the practical consequence of this doctrine involves matters belonging to our eternal welfare. If *our* doctrine is *false*, we pay homage to a mere creature, mistaken for Christ; if our doctrine is *true*, and that it is true you must at least be *inclined* to say, then those gentlemen are engaged in a most perilous and disastrous course, by persuading men to withhold that homage and adoration which are due to Jesus Christ, present in the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist.

THE REV. J. LYONS.

I COINCIDE in the opinion of Mr. Edgeworth, that discussion is not false liberality, and that it may lead to much good. We have had a practical exemplification of it in this and yesterday morning's discussion. Yesterday, I used the expression, "*the infallible teacher of an infallible Church*;" but this morning's discussion has taught me that I should have said, "*the independent teacher of an infallible Church*;" as Mr. Brown appears to think that he is at perfect liberty to form what judgment he pleases on books of authority in the Church of Rome. The Rev. gentleman has told you that the Breviary is a book of undoubted authority; and then he asserts that he is at liberty to reject any historical parts of it, that his own judgment may not peculiarly commend. Ask Mr. Brown what authorised formulary of the Church of Rome allows of such an assertion. He is commanded to receive the Breviary; and no exceptions are made to any words in it—it must be the whole Breviary, and nothing but the Breviary; he is not allowed to cast out a single syllable; and if he had read the Roman Ritual, he might have found that—

"First the Breviary, and then the Roman Missal were to be published with much carefulness and pastoral diligence."—(Quamobrem fel. record. Pius Papa V. Breviarium primum, et deinde Missale Romanum, multo studio et diligentia elaborata Pastorali providentia edenda censuit.—Rituale Rom. p. 4. ed. Venet. 1786.)

In this same book, the use of the Breviary miracles is declared to us. In pages 99 and 100, we read that when the priest goes to visit the sick, he is to tell them "particularly the examples of the saints, which are of great use"—

"Ac præsertim Sanctorum exempla, quæ plurimum valent."

Again, we are told—

"He will likewise propose to the sick person the martyrdoms and examples of the saints."—Proponet etiam ægrotanti . . . Sanctorum martyria et exempla.

But then it is added—

"These, however, are to be suggested opportunely and discreetly, lest trouble, and not comfort may affect the sick."—Hæc tamen opportune et discrete suggerantur, ne ægroto molestia, sed levamen offeratur.

But Mr. Brown tells us that the legends of this book are not essential to be believed; and then adds that it is

broken up into certain portions for each day, and read within the walls of this Sanctuary. It is rather extraordinary to read in the hearing of young men "*legendary tales*," which certainly ought to form no part of the worship of God. The Rev. gentleman has told us that there are only a few miracles in this book—which can be rejected or received, according to his own judgment. While Mr. Brown was speaking, I took up one of the volumes, in which I reckoned fifteen; if we multiply fifteen by four, (the number of volumes of which the Breviary consists) we should have sixty miracles; and if time permitted me to reckon them all, there would be found a number nearer to one hundred and sixty than sixty, which Mr. Brown feels himself at liberty to reject, without the slightest shadow of authority; so that here we see the benefit of this discussion, that the Rev. gentleman has been induced to think and speak for himself.

Yesterday, Mr. Brown said that he would answer my arguments, drawn from reason and common sense, by some references to the work of Abbadie on the Christian religion; and then he asserted that Transubstantiation was as undoubted a truth as the Trinity. This is a "*principii petitio*," begging the question. We deny that Transubstantiation is revealed in the Holy Scriptures. The Rev. gentleman has not yet proved it from Holy Scripture, and we cannot receive it upon any other authority. Mr. Brown reminds us that we ought not to use any argument from the understanding on this point. I will read one passage from the word of God, in addition to those which you have already heard from my friend, Mr. Tottenham. It is contained in the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, 10th chapter, 15th verse, where the Spirit of God by the Apostle thus writes—

"I speak as to wise men, JUDGE YE YOURSELVES WHAT I SAY."

And of what was he about to write? Even respecting the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; the Apostle therefore gives us full liberty to judge concerning these matters, and surely if Paul called upon the Corinthians to use their judgment on the Lord's Supper, Mr. Brown should not deny us the same liberty of judging respecting the doctrine of Transubstantiation. The Apostle proceeds to say—

"The chalice of benediction which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?"

Mr. Brown referred to various passages in the Acts of the Apostles yesterday, in support of the opinion that he holds of Christ's coming down upon the earth in his bodily form at different times after his ascension; and from thence he argued that he might come down in a bodily form into the wafer on the altar. There is no force in the argument, because it is impossible to prove from those passages that Christ came down *to the earth*; and had the Rev. gentleman read a little further in the book of the Acts, he would have found in the 26th chapter, (he quoted from the 9th) and the 19th verse, that he did not come down upon earth at all; because there we read—

“Wherefore, O king Agrippa, I was not incredulous *to the heavenly vision*.”

Here Paul speaks of it as a “heavenly vision”—not as an event that took place on earth, but as a vision that he saw in heaven. Mr. Brown also turned your attention to the 7th chapter of Acts as another proof that Christ came down to earth. This is rather an unhappy quotation to make, for in the 55th verse we read—

“But he, (Stephen) being full of the Holy Ghost, looking up steadfastly to heaven, saw the glory of God, and JESUS STANDING ON THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD.”

He did not see Jesus on earth, he saw him “standing at the right hand of God.”

“And he said, Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the SON OF MAN STANDING ON THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD.”

Mr. Brown has again brought us back to the 6th of John. I shall once for all meet his remarks on this chapter with this simple proposition; there is but one way of salvation from the fall of our first parents down to the latest period of time. There is only “one Lord,” and then, as the Apostle argues, there can be but “one faith.” In the 11th chapter of Hebrews, it is clearly declared that from the earliest period of the world's fall, faith alone was the grand means for the salvation of the children of God; but according to the assertion made by the Rev. gentleman from the 6th of John, it is absolutely necessary, literally to “eat the flesh, and drink the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ.” I ask, how was it possible for Abel, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, or any of the Patriarchs to be saved; for it is said in that chapter—

“*Except you eat his flesh, you have no life in you.*”

Now then, if these words are to be taken in their *literal* construction, it must follow that Abel, and all the Patriarchs of old, were shut out of the pale of salvation. But



when we take these words in the sense of *believing* on the Lord Jesus Christ, all appears plain and intelligible to us.

Mr Brown alluded to the miracle narrated in the 2nd of John. He said that the miracle at Cana in Galilee, and what he pleases to call the miracle of Transubstantiation, are similar to each other. If you recollect the parallel I drew yesterday between the loaves and fishes in the desert, and apply the same parallelism to the water converted into wine in Cana, and the asserted miracle of Transubstantiation, you will quickly perceive what dissimilarity there is between them.

I shall now turn to some remarks that Mr. Edgeworth has made, and I do say, that *he has not attempted to answer a single argument brought forward by Mr. Tottenham.* The Rev. gentleman has brought against us the charge of having used “ridicule and scorn” against the doctrine of Transubstantiation; and he appears to think this a very unscriptural, if not anti-scriptural, mode of handling the doctrine. I think it, however, a very scriptural method, perfectly scriptural, as I can prove from reading two or three verses of the word of God. If the Rev. gentleman will turn with me to the 3rd book of Kings, the 18th chapter, and 26th and following verses, he will there read—

“And they took the bullock which he gave them and dressed it: and they called upon the name of Baal from morning even till noon, saying, O Baal, hear us. But there was no voice, nor any that answered: and they leaped over the altar that they had made.”

We might apply the same language to the wafer on the altars of Roman Catholic Chapels; we may cry to it very long before it will hear us—

“And when it was now noon, Elias JESTED AT THEM, saying: Cry with a louder voice, for he is a god, and perhaps he is talking, or is in an inn, or on a journey, or perhaps he is asleep and must be awaked.”

Here is strong irony, deeply-cutting sarcasm, against the prophets of Baal. In the book of the Prophet Isaiah, 44th chapter, 12th verse, it is written—

“The smith hath wrought with his file, with coals, and with hammers he hath formed it, and hath wrought with the strength of his arm: he shall hunger and faint, he shall drink no water, and shall be weary. The carpenter hath stretched out his rule, he hath formed it with a plane: he hath made it with corners, and hath fashioned it round with the compass, &c. And it hath served men for fuel: he took thereof, and warmed himself: and he kindled it, and BAKED BREAD: BUT OF THE REST HE MADE A GOD, AND ADORED IT; he made a graven thing, and bowed down before it. Part of it he burnt with fire, and with part of it he dressed his meat: he boiled pottage, and was filled and was warmed, and said: Aha, I am warm, I have seen the fire. But the residue thereof he made a god, and a graven thing for himself: he boweth down before it, and adoreth it, and prayeth unto it, saying: Deliver me for thou art my God.

They do not consider in their mind, nor know, nor have the thought, to say I have burnt part of it in the fire, and I have baked bread upon the coals thereof; I have broiled flesh and have eaten, and of the residue thereof shall I make an idol? Shall I fall down before the stock of a tree?"

Here was cutting irony on the part of the Prophet Isaiah when inspired of God; he reproaches them because they made part of the wood a graven image, and part of it they put beneath their usual food, in order that they might dress it. We can say the same of the wafer of the Roman Catholic, part of the paste is sent to the Chapels to be transubstantiated into a god, and other parts of the same have been made up into bread, in order that it may be eaten. I know of an instance in the west of Ireland, where one portion of the wafers has been sent to the Roman Catholic Chapel for the purpose already mentioned, and another portion is used for the ordinary purpose of sealing deeds. The Rev. gentleman need not speak of "the unutterable sarcasm," which he says I used towards the wafers, when we find such strong language written in the words of the living God.

Mr. Edgeworth has also told us that the doctrine of Transubstantiation, as now taught, is one that has been received in all ages. I must beg leave to deny this, for when I refer to the primitive forms of ordination, and compare them with the present forms of the Church of Rome, they are quite dissimilar. I will read the present form of ordination used in the Roman Church; and also the ordination service which was used in early times. In the 4th Council of Carthage, A.D. 398, Canon 4, we have part of the primitive form of ordination—

"When the Presbyter is being ordained, the Bishop blesses him and holds his hands over his head, likewise all the Presbyters who are present hold their hands near the hands of the Bishop over his head."

In the Apostolic Constitutions the prayer which was used at ordination, is given to us—

"Look upon this thy servant added to the Presbytery, by the suffrage and judgment of all the clergy; and fill him with the spirit of grace and of counsel, that he may help and govern thy people with a pure heart—so that being filled with healing powers, and aptness in teaching the word, he may instruct thy people, and may serve thee sincerely with a pure heart and a willing mind, and may blamelessly perform the ministrations for the people, through Christ."

This prayer, with the laying on of hands, as related above, constituted the form of primitive ordination. The ordination service as used in the Church of Rome at the present day, is very different from this. The book I hold in my hand is the Pontificale Romanum; it was published by Clement the 8th, Urban the 8th, Benedict

the 14th, and Pius the 7th. At page 52, (ed. Rome 1818) part of the present form of the ordination of priests is given us—

“Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Masses, as well for the living as for the dead, in the name of the Lord. Amen.”

In the primitive form of ordination, there is no mention made of “offering sacrifice to God”—nothing of “celebrating Masses,” but simply “performing the ministrations for the people.” So that if we compare the form of ordination in the ancient Church with that now used in the Church of Rome, we have one strong negative argument, that they knew nothing about the doctrine of “offering Sacrifice to God,” in the Sacrifice of the Mass.

Mr. Edgeworth has dwelt for some time upon the “painful spectacle” of seeing men differ from each other. It is a “painful spectacle,” but it is one that must be endured to the end of the present dispensation. The Rev. gentleman must remember it is also painful to see Popes opposing Popes—Councils anathematizing Councils—the Pope excommunicating St. Cyprian and many Bishops, and other “painful spectacles” that we could bring forward in modern times, as well as in ancient days, if it were necessary to dwell upon the subject.

Mr. Edgeworth, in speaking of the body of Christ, says it is not “a carnal body;” and Mr. Brown has told us that it is “a spiritual, sacramental, and real body.” The Reverend gentleman denies it to be carnal; but then, I would ask, *what are bones and flesh? what are body and blood?* Are not these *carnal* things? How then can the Reverend gentleman say that there is nothing “carnal” in this sacrifice, when they confess with their own lips, that there is in it “body and blood, and bones and nerves?” It is rather singular that they should deny the carnality of the body, when they use *terms that signify carnality*.

The Reverend gentleman has spoken of the Reformation—of Luther—of Melancthon—and he has told us of “an unfortunate change that took place three hundred years ago.” He has not, however, informed us whether it is unfortunate for the Church of Rome to be deprived of much of her authority and power, or unfortunate for us to be delivered from the yoke of bondage and ignorance. It has, however, no connexion with the Sacrifice of the Mass, I shall therefore dismiss it.

The Rev. gentleman tells us, that if it had not been for Luther and other such men, we should now have been all of one mind.

I beg leave to tell him, that although Luther was the instrument, it was the allwise God who wielded that instrument, in order to effect our separation from the Church of Rome—in order that we should not believe as the Church of Rome does, that a piece of bread is made into a god, and then that we should fall down and worship it. We have to thank God alone, that thus he hath delivered us from such an act of idolatry, as we shall have occasion to shew it to be, in our further arguments against the Sacrifice of the Mass.

Mr. Edgeworth then proceeded to various quotations from the Fathers. He quoted Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Theodoret. I shall select only two of these quotations, one from Ignatius, the other from Justin Martyr, and I think that if the Rev. gentleman had read them before he quoted them, he would not have adduced them as evidence. I have now lying before me a copy of the book from which he quoted, it is “The Faith of Roman Catholics confirmed by Scripture, and attested by the Fathers, &c.” Mr. Edgeworth first read an extract from Ignatius, which concludes thus:—

“I desire to drink of God, his blood, which is charity incorruptible and eternal life.”

This passage clearly shows us, that he used the word blood in a *figurative* sense. He says that it is “charity incorruptible and eternal life.” Does the Rev. gentleman mean to say that Ignatius believed in the Transubstantiation of blood “into incorruptible charity and eternal life?” Mr. Edgeworth also tells us that Polycarp was instructed by Ignatius. Now, if Polycarp learned from Ignatius, it must have followed that Polycarp held that the blood of Christ was “incorruptible charity and eternal life.”

But passing on further, the Rev. gentleman says, that the Fathers were proving that the flesh is capable of eternal life. We, of the Church of England, use words very similar to the Fathers on this subject, and therefore there is not that great discrepancy between us and the Fathers on this point that has been asserted. In the Communion Service of our Church, we have these words—

“That our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us.”

Now, the argument that is based upon these words is this, that by the participation of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, our souls are washed in his blood from

the spots and stains of sin, and that our bodies will be raised up to eternal life together with the body of our Lord. In the 8th of Romans this truth is plainly set before us, in the 11th verse—

“If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you, he that raised up Jesus Christ from the dead, shall quicken also your mortal bodies, because of his Spirit that dwelleth in you.”

Thus it appears that the same Spirit which quickeneth our souls, is to quicken up our mortal bodies ; it is not therefore a corporal receiving of the literal body and blood of the Lord, that will raise up our bodies, but it is in consequence of our spiritual union with his body. In consequence of that spiritual union, no member of Jesus shall ever perish, for the very same spirit that hath put breath into the never dying soul, shall also quicken up the mortal body in the day of the Lord Jesus—

“He shall quicken also your mortal bodies, BECAUSE OF HIS SPIRIT that dwelleth in you.”

In the quotation from Justin Martyr, there is mention made of bread and wine tempered with water, and he says :—

“This food we call the Eucharist, of which they alone are allowed to partake, who believe the doctrines taught by us, and have been regenerated by water for the remission of sins, and who live as Christ ordained. Nor do we take these gifts, as *common bread and common drink*.”

Here is not a word about “the body and blood.” If I pleased, I could bring forward other passages from Justin Martyr, where he speaks of the bread and wine remaining the same in substance after consecration. In order to account for Justin Martyr’s silence respecting the body and blood, Mr. Edgeworth informs us, that the words “body and blood,” were not used, because Justin was writing to an heathen emperor. I should be sorry to find that holy fathers of olden times, were governed by the spirit of expediency, which governs too many in the present day ; that, because he was writing to an emperor, he was afraid to declare what he believed to be the truth of God. I would rather be inclined to think, that he was a holy man who would never refrain from explicitly declaring even to princes and kings of the earth, the truth as it is in Jesus. No feeling of expediency would restrain him from following in the path of his blessed Master and of the Apostles, who boldly spake the whole truth, before the governors of the earth, and before kings and emperors.

I will now follow the example of my friend, Mr.

Tottenham, and leaving the doctrine of Transubstantiation, pass on to "THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS."—There can be no *true* Sacrifice in that of the Mass, for this reason—first, because there was no *true* sacrifice in the last Supper; for, if there were no *true* sacrifice in the last Supper, there can be none in the Sacrifice of the Mass, which is said to be a continuation of it. Whatever, then, the last Supper was, so, according to the declaration of the Church of Rome, must be the Sacrifice of the Mass. If there were a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice offered in the last Supper, then, if it can be proved that the Sacrifice of the Mass is a continuation of it, there would be a proper and propitiatory sacrifice; but if there were no true and proper sacrifice in the Lord's Supper, as administered by Christ, then there can no true and proper sacrifice in the Mass.

Now, we also say, that, in order to constitute a *true* sacrifice, there must be a sacrificing priest, and also the shedding of blood. In the last Supper there was no shedding of blood, because the Lord was still living; he was sitting at the table in the presence of all his Disciples, exercising all the functions of life; he was speaking to them, and was blessing, and distributing the bread and the cup; he spoke many words of kindness and comfort to them; and these things shewed that he was still a living man; and that still his life's blood was flowing warmly from his heart throughout his members; and, therefore, there being no shedding of blood in the last Supper, it must evidently follow, that the Sacrifice of the Mass, said to be a continuation of that Supper, cannot be "a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice."

Moreover, I ask the gentlemen on the other side, to prove that Christ was a priest at the last Supper. They will find it hard to establish this point from Holy Scripture. If they endeavour to shew, that he was *then* consecrated to the office of a priest, I shall bring forward proofs to evidence that it did not occur *at that period*. Until the arguments are adduced to shew that he *was then* a priest, I shall remain silent on the subject.

We are also told, that the Sacrifice of the Mass is "an unbloody sacrifice." I cannot understand how this can be, because a true sacrifice for sin *required shedding of blood*, and it is said, besides, by the Church of Rome, to be in the cup, on the altars, and that it is poured from the cup into the mouth of the priest; yet we are told that there is no shedding of blood, whilst, at the same time, the priest

is said to drink the blood from the chalice. According, then, to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, there must be blood in what they call "the unbloody sacrifice."

We might go on to shew further, from the novelty of private masses, that there was no such doctrine believed in former times, as the Sacrifice of the Mass; because all the antient liturgies require both the priest and the people to be present, and both parties to receive the cup; but such a thing as "a private mass," we never hear or read of; and Bellarmin says, that the only way he can possibly collect that there were private masses, is "*ex conjecturâ*," "by conjecture."

"For, although we nowhere expressly read that Sacrifice was offered by the ancients, without the communion of any person or persons besides the priest,—nevertheless, we can easily gather it *from conjecture*."—Bellarmin. de Mis. lib. 2. c. 9.

There is another argument that lies against this Sacrifice of the Mass. It is *impossible for an individual to know* whether there be any real Transubstantiation; and unless there be real Transubstantiation, there cannot be any sacrifice in the Mass. It appears, that there are very many essential requisites in order to constitute Transubstantiation; there are *certain defects*, which, if they occur, then there is no real or true conversion. In the Roman Missal we find, that

"There may be defects in the *matter*, the *form*, and the *officiating priest*."

The defects of the *matter* may result from many things:—

"If the bread be not made of wheat, or if a quantity of any other grain be mixed with it; or, if it be any otherwise corrupted, then there is no Sacrament.—If it be made with rose, or any distilled water, the consecration is doubtful.—If the wine be turned sour, or be made from sour or unsound grapes, there is no consecration."

How can a communicant *know* that there has not been some other grain mixed with the wheaten flour, of which the wafer is made? If there be, then there is *no true conversion*. How can any man tell, whether the grapes of which the wine is made, were ripe or not?

Another defect may arise *from a diminution, or change in the words of consecration*, part of which are muttered too low to be heard by those present. The third deficiency may be the result of "*want of INTENTION*" on the part of the priest:—

"If he do not *intend* to consecrate, but acts in a delusory manner; like-



wise if any Hosts remain, through forgetfulness, on the altar, or any part of the wine, or any Host lies concealed, when he INTENDS to consecrate only those which are visible; likewise, if he have before him eleven Hosts and INTENDS to consecrate only ten, not determining which ten HE INTENDS, in these cases there is no consecration, because THE INTENTION IS REQUIRED."—Rom. Miss. de defect. cir. Mis. occur.

How can any member of the Church of Rome, possibly enter into the mind and feelings of the officiating priest?—how can he know, whether he has AN INTENTION of doing that which the Church commanded him to do—that is, to change the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ? He must have a glass placed over the priest's heart, in order that he should read all the intentions that are passing through his mind; for the INTENTION of the priest is absolutely necessary to constitute a true change in the elements of bread and wine. Therefore, when any, or all of these things are wanting,—*defect in the matter—defect in form, and defect in intention*—there is no Transubstantiation. From the defects that may occur in the elements, and in the intention of the priest, *it is manifestly impossible for a Roman Catholic to know, whether the substance before him is merely bread and wine, or that it is what assertion would make it—the body and blood of his risen Lord.*

The Sacrifice of the Mass sets aside the doctrine of faith in the Lord Jesus. According to the sophistries brought from the 6th of John by our opponents, it is asserted, that, by the simple act of eating the body and drinking the blood of the Lord, persons become partakers of eternal life. If, then, we can get eternal life by such a process, where is the use of faith? for the "*opus operatum*," or "*the thing done*," is sufficient to ensure salvation. But, what saith the Scriptures? In the Epistle to the Romans, the Apostle writes most fully on the doctrine of Justification, and tells us, in the 3rd chapter, 24th and following verses:—

"Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath proposed to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to the shewing of his justice for the remission of former sins, through the forbearance of God, for the shewing of his justice in this time: that he himself may be just, and the justifier of him who is of the faith of Jesus Christ."

In these verses we learn, that it is "*through FAITH in the blood*" of the Lord Jesus that we obtain eternal life. God hath been just in proposing his Son to be a propitiation for sin, and then freely justifying those who BELIEVE

in his name. In the opening of the 5th chapter, are also these words:—

“Being JUSTIFIED THEREFORE BY FAITH, let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ ; by whom also we have access THROUGH FAITH into this grace wherein we stand.”

Again, in the 2nd chapter and 8th verse of the Epistle to the Ephesians, are these words—

“ For by grace you are saved THROUGH FAITH ; and that not of yourselves, for it is the gift of God, NOT OF WORKS, that no man may glory.”

In opposition to these verses, the Church of Rome would make it appear (by her interpretation of the passages in the 6th of John), that the act of receiving the wafer ensures eternal life ; for a period at least, (for it is asserted, that the individual can finally fall from that state of grace) but still, as long as the wafer shall remain uncorrupt, that having Christ in him, it is impossible for him to die eternally. But, the Apostle tells us, that it is “ through faith, not by works, that we are saved.” In the Epistle to the Hebrews, 8th chapter and 4th verse, it is written—

“ If then he were on earth, he would not be a priest : seeing that there would be others to offer gifts according to the law.”

Here the Apostle informs us, that Christ is not on earth, for if he were on earth, he would not be a priest. Now, if Christ be not on earth, bodily present in the wafer, it is utterly impossible that it can be a true sacrifice, because there can be no true propitiatory sacrifice, where the body and blood of Christ are not. And, again, in the 9th chapter the 7th and following verses, he leads our minds to the day of atonement.—

“ But, into the second, the high-priest alone, once a year ; not without blood which he offereth for his own, and the people’s ignorance,” &c. &c.

---

THE REV. T. J. BROWN.

OF the arguments adduced by Mr. Lyons I shall take only a passing notice ; indeed, I believe I shall have to notice more of misrepresentations than of arguments. He contended that as Christ was in heaven when he was seen by St. Stephen, therefore Christ cannot be in the Eucharist. It is indifferent to the principal argument that I adduced, whether Christ was seen by St. Stephen in the heaven of

heavens, or only in that heaven which, as Mr. Tottenham has explained the Greek term, encompasses our earth; for it is plain that he appeared *to St. Paul on earth*; whence this conclusion is evident, that, whilst Christ's natural body is at the right hand of the Father, it may be after another manner elsewhere. Mr. Lyons asks how Abraham and the other Patriarchs could be saved, according to our interpretation of John vi., without eating of the flesh of Christ?—and I ask Mr. Lyons to tell me, how could Abraham be saved without being baptized?—for it is no less expressly said in John iii. 5, “Unless a man be born of water and the Spirit *he cannot enter* into the kingdom of God.” Mr. L. said that I had introduced a parallel between Transubstantiation and the miracle of Cana in Galilee. I introduced no such parallel; I only alluded to the miracle of Cana to shew that as in 1 Cor. xi. 23, and subsequent verses, the Eucharist is called bread after consecration; in like manner, after the miracle of Cana in Galilee, the wine was called by the appellation of its former substance, water. Mr. L. accuses Mr. Edgeworth of saying that the body of Christ in the sacrament was a carnal body—

Mr. *Lyons*.—No, no.

Mr. *Brown*.—Was *not* a carnal body. Mr. Edgeworth said only that the body of Christ was not eaten after the carnal manner in which the Jews understood the doctrines of Christ. Mr. L. censures Mr. Edgeworth's quotation, as if Justin Martyr did not use the words “body and blood” of Christ in the passage which Mr. E. adduced. Now, if the Rev. gentleman had paid any attention to the language of that quotation, which he actually had lying before him, he would have read these very precise and clear words:—

“Nor do we take these gifts as common bread and common drink, but as *Jesus Christ*, our Saviour, made man by the word of God, *took flesh and blood for our salvation*; in the same manner we have been taught that the food which has been blessed by the prayer of the words which he spoke, and by which our blood and flesh, in the change, are nourished, is *the flesh and blood of that Jesus incarnate*.”

I will now examine the objections of Mr. Tottenham. He has told you that I was serving the cause of infidels by the objections which I urged against the Protestant rule of faith. But be it remembered, that when I argued against the inconsistency with which it appeared to me to be disfigured, Mr. T. did not deprecate such objections upon the plea that in his rule there was *any mystery*, or I

should not have attempted to argue from reason against it. We, on the contrary, have always contended that such doctrines concerning the Eucharist and the Mass are *profound mysteries*; our opponents, therefore, are they who, as I have repeatedly shewn, by relying on the difficulties suggested by reason, furnish with weapons the enemies of the Christian name.

The Rev. gentleman says that I have not answered the objection, that “hair was Jerusalem,” and that this expression is an example of a figure parallel with that used in the words of the institution, “This is my body,” Ezek. v. 5.

“And thou, son of man, take thee a sharp knife, take thee a barber’s razor, and cause it to pass upon thine head and upon thy beard: then take the balances to weigh, and divide the hair, &c. This is Jerusalem.”

Now I put it to the common sense of any one,—whether in this instance, the language of the inspired text is throughout so evidently allegorical, there is any similarity to the language which Christ used at the last supper, under circumstances in which every thing should be clear and explicit?

I am called upon by Mr. T. to explain the celebrated passage from Exodus xii. 11, “It is the Lord’s passover;” and I think it is no difficult matter so to explain it as would satisfy even Zuinglius himself, if his judgment were not too prejudiced, that this cannot be placed on a parallel with the words of the institution. First, I call your attention to the evidently mysterious circumstances preceding the passage in question:—

“Thus shall ye eat it;—with your loins girded—your shoes on your feet—and your staff in your hand,—and ye shall eat it in haste; it is the Lord’s passover.”

These prepare the mind against a literal interpretation; they are a sort of *previous warning* that a typical meaning is *intended*. There was consequently no danger of mistake—no danger of any one’s imagining that the paschal lamb was *literally* the passover of the Lord. But, on the contrary, if the words of Christ at his last supper, whereby he instituted the Sacrament, were in like manner intended to be understood *figuratively*, the danger of mistake was imminent; nay, if Protestants be right, such mistake was universally made from the earliest times, as the authorities we have adduced prove. But, 2ndly, there is another exposition of the objected passage even more satisfactory. Recollect what I said when we discussed the Rule of Faith, that (as is well known) the

better informed of my hearers,) *punctuation* in the Scriptures is of *modern* introduction—that when they were originally delivered there was *no such guide* to their meaning. Well, then, let me take the Scriptures as I am entitled to take them, unfettered by your present punctuation, and all the difficulty becomes immediately removed. “Thus shall ye eat it; with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your staff in your hand; ye shall eat it in haste.” Then, the concluding part of the verse, “It is the Lord’s passover,” will be the commencement of a new sentence, and, without any reference to the paschal lamb, is explained by the words which immediately follow—“It is the Lord’s passover, *for I will pass through the land of Egypt this night,*” &c., leaving no parity between the two cases.

Lest it escape me, I am desirous of reading, before going further, an extract from a work in estimation amongst Protestants, where one of your celebrated writers says of those arguments which have been so often, in spite of my appeal to the good feelings of my opponents, brought against us. I recommend to Mr. Lyons, who I doubt not has read Faber’s “Difficulties of Romanism,” the following passage:—

“While arguing,” he observes, “on this subject (the doctrine of Transubstantiation), some persons, I regret to say, have been far too copious in the use of those unseemly terms *absurdity* and *impossibility*. To such language the least objection is its reprehensible want of good manners. A much more serious objection is, THE TONE OF PRESUMPTUOUS LOFTINESS WHICH PERVADES IT, and which is wholly unbecoming a creature of very narrow faculties. Certainly, God will do nothing *absurd*, and can do nothing *impossible*. But it does not therefore exactly follow, that our view of things should be always perfectly correct, and wholly free from misapprehension. CONTRADICTIONS WE MAY EASILY FANCY, where in truth there are none. Hence, before we venture to pronounce any particular doctrine to be a contradiction, we must be sure that we perfectly understand the nature of the matter propounded in that doctrine; for, otherwise, the contradiction may not be in the matter itself, but in our mode of conceiving it. In regard to myself, as my conscientiously finite intellect claims not to be an universal measure of congruities and possibilities, I deem it both more wise and more decorous to refrain from assailing the doctrine of transubstantiation, on the ground of its alleged absurdity or impossibility.

“BY SUCH A MODE OF ATTACK WE IN REALITY QUIT THE TRUE FIELD OF RATIONAL AND SATISFACTORY ARGUMENT. . . . . We believe the revelations of God to be essential, unerring truth. Our business, therefore, most plainly is, not to discuss the abstract absurdity and the imagined contradictoriness of transubstantiation, but to inquire, according to the best means which we possess, whether it be indeed a doctrine of holy scripture. If sufficient evidence shall appear to be the case, we may be sure that the doctrine is neither absurd nor contradictory. Receiving the Scripture as the infallible word of God, and prepared with entire prostration of mind to admit his declarations, I shall ever contend, that the doctrine of transubstantiation, like the doctrine of the Trinity, is a question of pure evidence; consequently, not to be judged of by its appearing to us possible or impossible.” pp 54, 55.

If this does not satisfy him, I wish to call his attention to one or two more short quotations from Protestant writers. Clarke, on the "Being and Attributes of God," p. 10, writes thus:—

"When once any proposition is clearly demonstrated to be true, it ought not to disturb us, that there be, perhaps, perplexing difficulties on the other side, which merely *for want of adequate ideas of the manner of the existence of the things demonstrated* are not easy to be cleared. Indeed, were it possible there should be any proposition which could equally be *demonstrated on both sides* of the question, or which could on *both sides be reduced to imply a contradiction* (as some have very inconsiderately asserted), this, it must be confessed, would alter the case. Upon this absurd supposition all difference of true and false, all thinking and reasoning, and the use of all our faculties, would be entirely at an end. But when to demonstration on the one side there are opposed on the other *only difficulties raised from our want of* HAVING ADEQUATE IDEAS OF THE THINGS THEMSELVES, *this ought not to be esteemed an objection of any real weight.*"

Humphrey Ditton, in his discourse upon the Resurrection, part 1, sect. 4, p. 15, London, 1714, says,—

"They must leave off all their quibbling and disputing, and take whatever they find plainly revealed in the Gospel; remembering that though infinite wisdom and goodness can never possibly oblige them to believe any thing *that is really absurd and contradictory*, or do any thing which is unreasonable; yet *they may be obliged to believe and practise many things* WHICH UNCONQUERED PREJUDICE MAY TELL THEM ARE ABSURD AND UNREASONABLE, and which they may think to be so, by using themselves to judge of the ways of God too much *by human rules and measures.*"

I wish the gentlemen on the other side had the candour of Faber, Ditton, and several other Protestant divines, whose writings I have before me, but from whom I have not time to quote more largely.

Mr. T. has denied that the catechetical discourses prove my point; for, he observes, it is an undoubted fact that Cyril does not refer "the secret" to the presence of Christ, but to the mystery of the Trinity. I shall not dwell long in establishing the contrary, for it can be speedily made evident. First, then, I call your attention to that quotation which I made just now from St. Cyril, wherein he speaks of an important communication made to the Catechumens, and with regard to which he had, till then, he remarks, *observed secrecy*. Now such secrecy referred to the *Eucharist* and the *Sacrifice of the Mass* as appears not only by that quotation, but also by an express testimony of the Synod of Alexandria, A. D. 340. Speaking of the Meletians—

"They are not ashamed," the Fathers say, "*to celebrate the MYSTERIES before the catechumens, and, perhaps, even before Pagans, forgetting that it is written that we are to conceal the mystery of the king; and regardless of the precept of the Lord, that we must not cast holy things to the dogs, or pearls*



before swine. For it is unlawful to lay the MYSTERIES open to the uninitiated, lest through ignorance they should turn them to ridicule, and lest the catechumens should become scandalized through an indiscreet curiosity."—*In the Apol. of S. Athanasius against the Arians*, tom. i. p. 133. Paris, 1698.

Now, the CELEBRATION of the mysteries, concealed from the catechumens, cannot be the doctrine of the Trinity. Moreover, that by the mysteries was understood the substantial presence of Christ, and the sacrifice of his body and blood on the Christian altars, is proved from a book, written by St. Ambrose, almost exclusively on this subject, and entitled "De Mysteries"—"Concerning the Mysteries." Again, St. Gaudentius, Bishop of Brescia, in his fifth discourse, observes that he had put off until the paschal discourses—

"To speak of the ceremonies described in Exodus, on the manner of celebrating the paschal solemnity, because," adds he, "this splendid night requires our instruction to be adapted rather to the circumstances of the time, than to the lesson of the day, in order that the Neophytes may, for the first time, be taught in what manner we partake of the paschal sacrifice."

I will add only one more quotation taken from Letter 16, Tom. 2, p. 20, Ed. Bened. of St. Augustin's works, where Maximus of Medaurus, tauntingly asks—

"What is this God, which you other Christians consider as particularly belonging to yourselves, and which you say you see present in your secret places?"  
Et in locis abditis præsentem nos videre componitis?

This cannot be the mystery of the Trinity; but it evidently is the mystery of the Eucharist. I could advance innumerable other proofs to the same effect.

But, said Mr. Tottenham, Julian the Apostate knew nothing of Christ's presence, nor of Transubstantiation, or he would have charged the Christians with its absurdity. I have read a little on this subject, and I wish to inform Mr. T. that the silence of the apostate Emperor, respecting the mystery of the Eucharist, in those parts of his writings which have come down to us, may satisfactorily be accounted for by several reasons. First, Julian's work consisted originally, as St. Cyril of Alexandria tells us, of three books, of which there are preserved to us *at most but one*, in the refutation of Julian by St. Cyril. Now, although the doctrine of Transubstantiation is not ridiculed in that *one book* which remains, does the conclusion hold that it was not ridiculed in the others that are lost? In the second place, it is by no means certain that we have this one book entire. Thirdly, the discipline of the *secret*, regarding the sacrament, will account for the omission by St. Cyril of any invectives penned by Julian against it, if



such had existed. Indeed, we find that, from reverence for the secret, Cyril does, *professedly*, pass over much of the ridicule which Julian has thrown on the mystery of *baptism*. Now, as St. Cyril passes over a portion of the ridicule which Julian attempts to throw on *one mystery*, may we not suppose that he would pass over that which may have been directed against *another*, far more august and more surpassing human understanding. In the fourth place, Mr. Tottenham sadly fails in his argument, which proves too much, viz., that even the Resurrection of Christ was not in the 4th century, an article of Christian belief. For if Julian's object had been to turn into ridicule the mysteries of Christianity, surely he would not have passed by that of the *resurrection*. Now, in the one book that alone remains of the three which he composed, there is not a word against that important doctrine; yet to Pagans we know that our Saviour's *resurrection* afforded as fruitful a theme for declamation and abuse of the Christian religion, as now does the doctrine of *Transubstantiation* to our opponents.

I beg leave now to call your attention to an important consideration; that the discipline of the *secret*, which, as I have shown I hope to your satisfaction, regarded principally the mysteries of the Eucharist, and of the Sacrifice of the Mass, was a discipline inconceivable according to the Protestant belief; but that, supposing the Fathers held the Catholic doctrine of the real presence, not only does the motive of that discipline become intelligible, but moreover highly necessary.

If the Primitive Fathers had held the doctrine of Protestants, what was more easy than to meet the charge of mysterious secrecy which was oftentimes urged against them *as a crime*?—what more easy than to bring their accusers to their places of worship, and to say: “We have no mysteries which we are ashamed to exhibit: enter our assemblies, and you will see nothing that should create scandal.” But, far from acting thus, they *cautiously abstained* from revealing the mysterious rites which were performed at their religious assemblies; and hence were circulated against them the most grievous calumnies. Moreover, the very nature of some of those calumnies that the Christians put to death *an infant*—that they *drank its blood, and ate its flesh*, which could have had its origin only in the imperfect notion which had got abroad respecting what took place in their secret worship,—forms another argument in favour of their belief in

the substantial presence of Christ. Nay more, the Gnostics, having some information of what was done by the Christians, used, in imitation thereof, actually to put to death and devour a new-born infant in their profane rites. A similar confirmation is drawn from the practice of the Valentinian Mark, who in order to counterfeit the Christian sacrifice, was accustomed to infuse, by some juggling trick, a red substance into the wine in the chalice, which he then pretended had become blood. This, which I repeat was meant to be an imitation of the mystery, supposed to be performed in the Christian temples, is a proof, that, in the earliest times, some *change of substance* was supposed to take place upon the Christian altars, even by those who could not entirely penetrate into the secrecy that was observed. I contend, then, that this discipline is a strong argument for us; because there was *no motive* that could have induced the Christians to affect such secrecy, if they believed *the Protestant doctrine*; but there was *the strongest motive* if they believed *the Catholic doctrine*. In the latter case they would apprehend that *scandal* might result from the revelation of so incomprehensible a mystery, and that foul *blasphemies* would be vented against it by the Pagans of early times, such as are uttered daily by those *who now attack* it. Accordingly, we actually do find *these two reasons* assigned by the early Christians, among the motives they had for observing secret their belief in the mystery of the Altar. St. Cyril, of Jerusalem, in his sixth catechetical discourse, p. 106. Paris, 1720, says

“We make use of obscure expressions before the catechumens, in order that those who are not instructed *may not be injured by them.*”

The synod of Alexandria, held in 340, speaks thus:

“It is not lawful openly to disclose the mysteries to the uninitiated, lest through ignorance *they should ridicule them*, and lest the catechumens should happen to be scandalized by an indiscreet curiosity.”

In his seventh book against Julian the Apostate, above quoted, St. Cyril writes—

“That he would have been afraid of being understood by the uninitiated, because,” said he, “people *generally ridicule* what they do not understand, and ignorant persons, not aware of the weakness of their own minds, *despise what they should most of all admire.*”

I have before me other passages to the same effect, which I might adduce, and which clearly establish that the Discipline of the Secret regarded the mysteries of the Eucharist and the Sacrifice of the Mass, which were concealed sedulously in the primitive Church. Now, as I have more than once observed, had it held the Protestant

doctrine, the primitive Church could have had no motive for such concealment. What could be more satisfactory than to challenge the Pagans to inspect their assemblies. “In the mysteries which we celebrate,” they might have said; “you will find nothing but a morsel of bread, and a little wine, given to be eaten and to be drank, as *figures merely* of Jesus Christ, whose flesh and blood we eat and drink *by faith only*.” But you have heard a very different language held by the holy Fathers.

I now pass to the principal point of this controversy,—the discussion of which I thought it necessary to defer, because I considered it quite essential that I should establish, in the first place, the doctrine of the real presence; or, as the advocates of the other side choose to call it, the bodily presence of Christ.

What is meant by the term sacrifice? Of this we have various definitions given us by Protestants. I shall, at present, refer only to that which is put forward by Melancthon, in his “Apology for the Confession of Augsburgh”:—

“Opus quod Deo reddimus, ut eum honore afficiamus:—any service which we render to God, that we may honour him.”

Now, I object, and the gentlemen on the other side ought to object, to this definition of Sacrifice; for it is proved to be incorrect by the written word of God in the Prophet Hosea, chap. vi. verse 6—

“I desired *mercy*, and *not sacrifice*.”

Here, mercy is opposed to sacrifice, and yet mercy is a work whereby we honour God. Other Protestants have considered a sacrifice to be *every good work* we do, because occasionally we find in Scripture such works called Sacrifices; but you will always see appended thereto some term which distinguishes them from a *real* sacrifice. They are sacrifices of *praise*, or sacrifices of a *troubled spirit*, &c., and not *simply* sacrifices. Protestants have objected to us also a passage in the 10th book of St. Augustin De Civitate Dei, where he says—

“Every good work is a *true* sacrifice.”

But he did not intend to define what constituted the *essential difference* of sacrifice, but only what makes a sacrifice *acceptable*. Every good work is “a *true*,” that is, an *agreeable* sacrifice; but as yet we have not arrived at a proper definition of a real sacrifice. A sacrifice, according to the idea given us by the Holy Scriptures under the law of nature and of Moses, may be accurately defined:

“ The oblation of a *sensible* thing, consecrated by a mystical rite, with *some* change of the victim, and presented to God alone by his *legitimate* minister, in acknowledgment of his *supreme* power over all creatures.”

The matter of a sacrifice must, therefore, be something sensible, in order to unite men in public worship; and it must be consecrated by a mystical rite, whereby that which before was profane is *made sacred*, according to the derivation of the term Sacrifice from two Latin words—*sacrum facere*.

Now, we contend that we have on our altars such a real sacrifice; that of which I laid before you yesterday a correct exposition in certain extracts from Catholic writers, and which, on account of the great importance of the subject, I think it necessary to repeat in this place:—

“ Our Saviour,” writes the author of *Roman Catholic Principles*, “ in leaving to us his body and blood, under two distinct species or kinds, instituted not only a *Sacrament*, but also a *Sacrifice*; a commemorative sacrifice, distinctly shewing his passion and death until He come. For as the Sacrifice of the Cross was performed by a distinct *effusion* of his blood, so is that sacrifice *commemorated* in this of the altar by a *distinction of the symbols*. Jesus, therefore, is here given not only to us, but for us; and the Church is thereby enriched with a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice, usually termed the *Mass*: *propitiatory* we say, *because representing in a lively manner, the passion and death of our Lord, it is peculiarly pleasing to our eternal Father, and thus more effectually applies to us the all-sufficient merits of the Sacrifice of the Cross.*”

Bossuet in the 14th section of his “ *Exposition of Catholic Doctrine*,” thus expresses himself:—

“ The Church is so far from believing, that any thing is wanting to the *Sacrifice of the Cross*, that she deems it, on the contrary, *so perfectly and so fully sufficient*, that whatever is afterwards added, has been instituted *to celebrate its memory, and to apply its virtue*. We acknowledge, that *all the merit of the redemption* of mankind is derived *from the death* of the Son of God; when, therefore, in the celebration of the divine mysteries, we say: *We offer thee this holy victim; we pretend not by this oblation, to make or to present to God a new payment of the price of our salvation; but to offer to him, in our behalf, the merits of Jesus Christ present, and that infinite price which he once paid for us upon the cross.*”

This is the correct representation of the Catholic doctrine by which we should be judged, and I request you not to regard those different notions that are oftentimes maliciously imputed to us.

In proof that this Sacrifice of the Mass is the true Christian sacrifice, I call your attention to the prophecy of Malachi, chap. i. verse 10, 11—

“ I have no pleasure in you saith the Lord of hosts, neither will I accept an offering at your hand. For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles: and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering.”

Now, observe here, first, the rejection of all ancient sacrifices, “ I have *no pleasure* in you saith the Lord of

Hosts, *neither will I accept an offering at your hands.* Observe, secondly, the prediction of a new sacrifice which is to take place of the ancient sacrifices. “From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering.” Observe, in the third place, the universality of this sacrifice, “from the rising of the sun even to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place, &c.” Attend also I request you to the force of the terms employed in this magnificent prediction—“in every place incense shall be offered unto my name.” In the Hebrew text it is *Quether*, signifying, according to Parkhurst, either incense, or sacrifice. The term rendered here “a true oblation,” is in the Hebrew *Minehah* or *Mincha*, signifying any offering or victim, but, as Parkhurst says, *usually signifying an offering composed of the finest flour.* Now, in the exercise of our judgment, these characteristics of the future sacrifice are fulfilled in the sacrifice of our altars only; and are not fulfilled either in the sacrifice of the cross, or in any other kind of sacrifice, which has existed in the Christian dispensation. First, the matter of the sacrifice, *Minehah* or *Mincha*, expresses in its literal and more usual meaning, an oblation formed of the finest flour, such as is the visible and external matter of the sacrifice of our altars. Secondly, in the sacrifice of our altars, we have a victim far superior to anything that was offered among the ancient sacrifices. Thirdly, in the sacrifice of our altars is fulfilled that part of the prediction “from the rising of the sun until the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered to my name, and a pure offering;” the Catholic sacrifice being celebrated at every hour of the day, according to the difference of latitudes in the Christian world. For as the Catholic religion is the religion of the Christian globe, and its members constitute the largest portion of believers beyond all comparison, its Sacrifice may be truly said to be offered, “from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same.”

Those characteristics predicted by Malachi, to be fulfilled in the Christian sacrifice, are not fulfilled in the sacrifice of the Cross; therefore the sacrifice of the Cross was not the sacrifice predicted by that Prophet. First, the sacrifice predicted by Malachi is to be in every place.

Now, we well know that the sacrifice of the Cross was offered but in *one place*, upon Mount Calvary. The second circumstance of the sacrifice predicted by Malachi is, that it shall “be offered from the rising of the sun till the going down of the same.”—Now the sacrifice of the Cross has neither been offered in every place, nor was it offered “from the rising of the sun to its going down,” but it continued only from the sixth hour, that is mid-day, until the ninth hour. Thirdly, the sacrifice of Malachi is to be offered *amongst the Gentiles*; “my name shall be great *among the Gentiles, and in every place*,” &c. The Sacrifice of the Cross did not take place *among the Gentiles*, but in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. Therefore, I repeat, the circumstances foretold are fulfilled in the Sacrifice of our altars, and not in the Sacrifice of the Cross.

Neither are those characteristics of the predicted Sacrifice fulfilled in a *commemorative* Sacrifice of the Cross, as many Protestants have imagined: I speak of a mere commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross, by faith or figure only; for *ours* is a *commemoration* of the Sacrifice of the Cross, but containing in reality the victim thereon offered. First, the sacrifice spoken of here, in the words of the text implies a real, true, and substantial sacrifice. The term *Minehab*, or *Mincha*, implies most distinctly a *real oblation*, and not an oblation in *figure* only. Secondly, in the old law were *many figures* of the Sacrifice of the Cross, not less expressive thereof, nay, in some respects, even more so than any commemorative sacrifice among Protestants in the new law; for example the sacrifice of the paschal lamb. Yet it is said in the 10th verse that the Lord had “no pleasure *in them*, neither would he accept an offering at their hands.” Thirdly, a mere figurative sacrifice would not deserve the high encomiums passed, by the prophet, upon the sacrifice which he foretels. Fourthly, in the Protestant Church *I am unable* to discover any *public sacrifice*, even such as is commemorative merely. In your Common Prayer Book, I find it related indeed that Christ did offer a sacrifice. I find, too, in the invocation upon the bread, the words of Christ pronounced, “This is my body;”—but I find no form of *offering to God* that which is placed upon the Protestant tables as a *sacrifice* commemorative, even, of the Sacrifice on the Cross. Hence a very celebrated Protestant, Dr. Grabe, was so dissatisfied with the Liturgy of the Established Church, which he confessed



did not contain the sacrifice announced by the Prophet, and whereof he discovered splendid proofs in the practices of Christian antiquity, that from the ancient liturgies he extracted a different form of worship, including a real oblation and sacrifice, which he introduced into his system.

Lastly, this sacrifice predicted by the prophet is not fulfilled by any sacrifice *of good works*, as other Protestants have maintained. First, *this* is to be a *pure* oblation; good works, as the 12th of the 39 Articles says, are not in every respect pure. Secondly, *this* is to take place of the unclean sacrifice of Jews; but *the Jews* could perform *some good works*. Thirdly, it is to be accompanied *by incense*. This the Reverend gentlemen opposite will be disposed to explain figuratively, as they did the words of the institution; but exercising *my* judgment, as they authorise “every meanest outcast of society” to do, upon the meaning of the sacred text, to me it appears too emphatical to be employed figuratively. Fourthly, the term Minehah, or Mincha, expresses, as I have again and again said, a true and real oblation. From all these circumstances I argue that the sacrifice predicted by the Prophet is *not the Sacrifice of the Cross*—that it is *not a mere figurative commemoration* of the Sacrifice of the Cross—that it is not the sacrifice *of good works only*—therefore, it remains that it should be the sacrifice of the Catholic Church: for this is *the only sacrifice* which combines all the characteristics applied by the Prophet to the sacrifice he foretells. Such is the result of *our interpretation* of Scripture. Now, as these gentlemen give out that “every meanest outcast of society is commanded by God to exercise his private judgment upon the meaning of the sacred text,” I contend that they are not justified in interfering with what they assert to be a *Divine command*—that there is an inconsistency in their coming forward to force upon us their new system of religion, different from that we have so long held. I maintain that *by their principles* we are justified in our interpretation, and they are not justified in attempting to interfere with our belief.

I go on to a second proof, borrowed from Ps. cx. 4. “The Lord hath sworn and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever *after the order of Melchizedec*,” which words are in Hebrews x. 24. applied to Christ. In the exercise of *my* judgment I might rest upon this proof; but on the present occasion I shall not dwell upon it, not



because I am not satisfied that we have therein a warrant for the Catholic sacrifice; but because I find that it would lead, in order to establish it satisfactorily, to a longer discussion than time will now permit.

---

THE REV. E. TOTTENHAM.

MR. CHAIRMAN,—Before I proceed to notice any thing that has been advanced on the other side, I wish to impress strongly on the minds of all in this assembly that, when Mr. Edgeworth stood up to speak, professedly in reply to me, *from the commencement to the very close of his speech, he has scarcely glanced at a single argument that had been adduced in my address!*

Mr. Edgeworth says that I expounded the passages cited on this question in *one* way, and that Roman Catholics expound them in *another*; and he tells us it is a painful spectacle to see men differ in the interpretation of these passages of Holy Writ. What then is his expedient in order to get us out of the difficulty? He refers to THE FATHERS, and he gives a variety of quotations (and professes to be able to give many more) from the writings of those who lived in the early ages of the Church. Did I think it at all *necessary* to my argument, *I could easily occupy my three-quarters of an hour in giving passages from the Fathers of the Church AGAINST* the doctrine of Transubstantiation. I believe it would be found, upon a *full and accurate* examination, that the doctrine was *perfectly unknown in the early ages, and to the really primitive Fathers*; however, suppose the Rev. Gentleman and myself were *now* to occupy our time in adducing passages on each side of the question, let me ask, how would that get us out of the difficulty of which he complains? He says there exists a difficulty, when we have but the simple text of Scripture, and, in order to remove it, he refers to the primitive Fathers—but then *he* quotes one Father, appearing to give one interpretation, and *I* quote another Father appearing to give a different interpretation; and thus (on account of the impossibility of our mutually examining the quotations, in all cases, *at the present moment*, and then, after examination, either admitting or rejecting them), instead of the difficulty being removed, it is marvellously increased. How is a poor

and unlearned man to be relieved from his difficulty by such a course of proceeding, when *he* can know nothing of the opinions of the Fathers upon texts of Scripture, unless he takes them *upon trust*.

But, in referring to that “most unfortunate change” (as he termed it), the Reformation, the Gentleman endeavours to place us in a degree of difficulty because Luther and others of the early reformers did not at once throw off all the errors which *we* believe to exist in the Church of Rome, relative to this very subject. Now it was too much to expect, that when a man came out of so complicated a system as that of the Church of Rome, he should all at once see the truth in *all* its purity and glory. It was natural that the casting off of error should be *gradual*, and therefore several of the *early* reformers had, for a time, and some of them up to the period of their death, *somewhat* of error commingled with the mass of truth which they held. This was all very natural; but are *we* placed in any difficulty because Luther held *somewhat* of that which we believe to be error in the Roman Church? Not at all, for we profess not to follow Luther farther than Luther follows Scripture. But I *retort* the argument on my Rev. opponent. If *we* are in a difficulty because Luther differed from us somewhat on *this* subject, what will our friends opposite think of the difficulty in which *they* are placed, when they recollect that many of the Divines in their Church have differed with them, being compelled at last to confess the fact *that Transubstantiation was not to be proved from Scripture*; and have taken refuge in some *other* authority whereby to prove this doctrine. Let us select a few instances. Cardinal Cameracensis says:—

“Transubstantiation cannot be proved from Holy Writ.”

Cardinal Cajetan declares:—

“There does not appear out of the Gospel *any thing to compel us to understand these words literally*, namely, ‘This is my body:’ and truly that presence in the Sacrament, which the Church holds, cannot be proved from these words of Christ unaided by the declaration of the Church.”—See Bishop Cosin’s “History of Transubstantiation,” for the two preceding extracts.

And yet indeed Mr. Edgeworth insists upon *the clearness* with which these words prove Transubstantiation, and expresses his great astonishment that we should be so slow in apprehending them in that meaning which he attaches to them! Scotus held the same view as those already quoted, but instead of reading his testimony I shall produce an extract from Cardinal Bellarmine:—

"For Scotus, whom Cameracensis follows, says three things. \* \* \* He says, secondly, that *there is no passage in Scripture so express as evidently to compel the admission of Transubstantiation without the declaration of the Church.*"

Then follows Bellarmine's comment—

"— And *this is not wholly improbable*; for although the Scripture above cited seems to us sufficiently clear to convince any man who is not self-willed, yet *whether this be so may well be doubted, seeing that the most learned and keen-sighted men, such as more particularly was Scotus, think differently.*"—Bell. de Sac. Euch. lib. 3. c. 23.

Here we have Roman Catholic divines *admitting* that Transubstantiation cannot be proved from Scripture, and believing it simply on the authority of the Church; and yet we are told it is *marvellous* that we cannot see this doctrine *so plainly written in the Word of God!*

My opponent seems to have dwelt with peculiar emphasis upon the expression employed by me with respect to Julian, the "illustrious Pagan." Now, if I used such an expression, as I believe I did in passing, I need scarcely observe, in extenuation, that I did not apply the term in reference to his *principles*, for of course his principles I must abhor.

Mr. E., as I have just now stated, refers to the opinions of some of the Reformers, but he takes care to add, that he does not wish to impress upon the minds of those present the authority of *such men!* It was *their crime*, he says, that they separated from the Church of Rome, and had it not been *for them*, we might have now been united in the same faith! Yes, Sir, we might; and the Reverend Gentleman could have told us moreover, that if the Apostles—those men who were said to have "turned the world upside down," had not gone to the various nations in the world, to disturb the unity of spiritual death which existed among them, we might have been to this day enjoying *the unity of Paganism*. Unity, Sir, is a good thing, but then it must be unity of a right and Scriptural kind. There may be unity of *error*—there may be unity of *spiritual death*—and it was the duty of the Reformers, and it is equally ours, *to protest* as loudly against such a false and hollow unity, as to be anxious for *that* unity which has truth for its essence, and Christian principle for its foundation.

With regard to the subject of *Idolatry*, upon which we insisted, I am told that, *if I believed the doctrine of Transubstantiation*, of course I should not hesitate to fall down, as Roman Catholics do, *to adore the Host*. I must admit that perhaps I should not hesitate *so much* as I would at the present moment, but I confess, after a

knowledge of what we have heard to-day, I should hesitate *very considerably*. You have listened to Mr. Lyons whilst quoting from a book, whose authority is indisputable, namely, THE MISSAL; and you have seen that (even supposing we were to *admit* the doctrine of Transubstantiation in the abstract) *there are cases, and those a great many*, in which, upon the *confession* of Roman Catholics themselves, *the consecration may fail*; and therefore, in *such* a case, that which we should fall down before and worship would be *confessedly only bread and wine*. If the *bread* be not of a certain quality—if the *wine* be sour, or has other defects—if the *intention of the priest* be wanting—if there be defects in any of these points, the testimony of the Roman Missal is, that *in none of those cases is the consecration valid*, and of course there takes place *no Transubstantiation*. Therefore, I say, *with the liability* to such defects and contingencies as these, even if I believed Transubstantiation abstractedly, I should hesitate much about falling down *to adore* the elements.

A considerable portion of time has been occupied in producing extracts from the Fathers. Mr. Edgeworth commented at some length upon certain of these extracts. He adduced Justin Martyr and others, and, in following him during the reading of the quotations, I confess I was not able to see any proof in them of the doctrine of Transubstantiation. For, be it observed, the passages cited from the Fathers which merely *call* the elements “*the body and blood of Christ*,” which merely *use the terms* “*flesh and blood*,” *do not prove the doctrine*. We have no hesitation in using just the same terms as Justin Martyr and Ignatius do; and, as you heard before, we employ, in the Communion Service of the Church of England, the expression, “*We spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood*.” So that *it is not from the use of these terms merely* that any argument is to be derived in favour of Transubstantiation; for they are but the echo of Scripture, and as with Scripture so with them, the controversy still exists *as to the sense in which they are to be taken*, whether *literally* or *figuratively*.

Reference has been made to, I must say, a most unfortunate passage in Theodoret. Mr. E. read you only a *portion* of it—now *I shall read the continuation*. So far as my opponent read, it did not prove a particle of his case; and, if I read the remainder, it will prove *the contrary*. In the dialogue between Orthodoxus and Eranistes (two imaginary persons, the former the representative of the

true faith, and the latter of the Eutychian heresy), as contained in the writings of Theodoret, we read thus:—

“ *Orthodoxus*. Tell me, now, the *mystical symbols*, which are offered to God by the priests, of what are they the *symbols*?—*Eranistes*. Of the body and blood of the Lord.—*Orthod.* Of his true body or not?—*Eran.* Of his true body.—*Orthod.* Very well, for *every image* must have its original.—*Eran.* I am happy you have mentioned the divine mysteries. Tell me, therefore, what do you call the gift that is offered before the priests’ invocation.—*Orthod.* This must not be said openly; for some may be present who are not initiated.—*Eran.* Answer, then, in hidden terms.—*Orthod.* We call it an aliment made of certain grains.—*Eran.* And how do you call the other symbol?—*Orthod.* We give it a name that denotes a certain beverage.—*Eran.* And after the consecration what are they called?—*Orthod.* The body of Christ, and the blood of Christ.—*Eran.* And you believe that you partake of the body and blood of Christ?—*Orthod.* So I believe.”

Now, in all this, is there any thing to support Transubstantiation? The elements are called, in the former part, the *symbols* of Christ’s *true* body, and the *image* of the *original*. Therefore they could not have been really the true body or the original, but they represented the existence of them. And in the latter part, that is merely said, which every Protestant admits (as I told you a few minutes ago), that after consecration the elements are *called* the body and blood of Christ, but *not* that they are *actually changed into them*. The Eutychian heretic, however, in order to maintain his tenet that the human nature of Christ was absorbed in the divine, *manifestly perverts the language* of *Orthodoxus* (as we shall see presently), *as if* it implied a *physical* change in the elements, and thus proceeds:—

“ *Eran.* As the symbols, then, of the body and blood of Christ were different before the consecration of the priest, and after that consecration are changed, and become something else, in the same manner we (*Eutychians*) say, the body of Christ, after his ascension, was changed into the Divine substance.”

Here was the argument and conclusion of the *Eutychian heretic* (not of *Orthodoxus*, the character introduced, nor of Theodoret, the writer), and *here Mr. Edgeworth stopped*, supposing that the passage proved Transubstantiation for him. If the heretic had concluded *aright*, this part of the passage would indeed have favoured Mr. E.; but what was the reply of *Orthodoxus*? He shows *that the heretic had mistaken the meaning of his words*, and he completely *overthrows the idea of a physical change* in the elements; for he rejoins—

“ You are caught in the net which you yourself have woven. For THE MYSTICAL SYMBOLS, AFTER CONSECRATION, LOSE NOT THEIR PROPER NATURE, FOR THEY REMAIN IN THE FORMER SUBSTANCE (οὐσίας), AND SHAPE, AND

APPEARANCE : AND THEY MAY BE SEEN AND FELT JUST AS THEY WERE BEFORE CONSECRATION.”—Theod. Dial. Opera. vol. iv. p. 84, 85. Lutetiæ Paris. 1642.

Such, you perceive, is the testimony of Theodoret himself, that the elements continue, *after* their consecration, in *their original substance*, form, and appearance. Sir, I do not wish to occupy my time in referring at large to the Fathers, when I have more important branches of evidence to adduce ; but as *this* passage is generally deemed one of *considerable moment*, I have referred to it at some length in order to shew, first, that even so far as it was quoted by my opponent it does not prove any thing for Transubstantiation ; and, secondly, that when *the continuation* of it is given, it proves *directly the reverse*.

Here I may take leave of Mr. Edgeworth for the present, and direct my attention to the observations of Mr. Brown. You will remember that, on a *previous* occasion, he had charged me with putting weapons into the hands of Socinians and infidels by the line of argument adopted against Transubstantiation. In reference to this statement, while I endeavoured to point out its futility, I *retorted* by charging him with doing the same, more extensively and truly, in the discussion on the Rule of Faith. And how does he attempt to evade this retort ? He asserts that the cases are not parallel, because I do not rest my argument, in the latter instance, on the fact of the Rule of Faith being a *mystery*, whereas he says his doctrine of Transubstantiation is a mystery. When attempting to establish this want of parallelism, he might have recollected what had been more than once affirmed on our side, that if by this he means a *revealed* mystery, he is proceeding altogether on a *petitio principii*—a begging of the question. He is *assuming* that Transubstantiation is revealed, *which is just the point that we dispute*.

Upon the passages, “ This (i. e. the hair) is Jerusalem ”—“ It is the Lord’s Passover ”—and others of a similar kind, I shall dwell no longer, for we have rung changes enough upon those parallelisms ; and we may leave to the meeting and to the public at large to judge on which side *truth* and *consistency* lies with regard to them.

But Mr. Brown seems to rejoice at the apparent triumph he gains, because Mr. Faber and others have thrown the arguments from *reason* overboard, and he wishes *we* possessed the *candour* of those Protestant divines. This, after all, makes very little for the question itself, nor does it



much affect our candour. It is only the private opinion of a few individuals, setting aside *a particular line* of argument, the force or weakness of which is of course to be judged of *by all before whom it comes*. I would notice, however, more particularly one passage quoted from Clarke, "On the Being and Attributes of God."—(See quotation at length in Mr. Brown's last speech.)—Observe accurately the wording of it:—

"When once any proposition is demonstrated to be true, it ought not to disturb us that there may be perplexing difficulties on the other side, &c. &c. But when to demonstration on the one side, there are opposed on the other *only* difficulties raised from our want of having adequate ideas of the things themselves, this ought not to be esteemed an objection of any real weight."

Why, Sir, *that is just what I have said from the beginning*. I stated, (pp. 311, 312, and 339) that if once the doctrine of Transubstantiation *could be clearly demonstrated from Scripture*, then we should give up all other arguments. I said, in speaking of the objections from reason, that, while we would not argue against a doctrine from reason *in the first instance*, nor reject it *because* it was mysterious, it was yet fair to use such objections *when we had first proved to our own satisfaction that the doctrine was not in Scripture*; and this is just the course we adopted.

Just now I caught Mr. Edgeworth in giving only a portion of a passage from Theodoret which (as he supposed) suited his purpose, and now, with respect to one from St. Cyril of Jerusalem, I have detected Mr. Brown in a *similar* proceeding. The latter gentleman calls our attention to Cyril's catechetical lectures, and in reference to the secrecy observed in the primitive Church, he endeavours to prove that the doctrine of *the bodily presence* was the *grand* secret of the mysteries. Now I before asserted that it was *not*. I did not, indeed, affirm that the Trinity was the *only* secret, but that it was the *grand* secret of the ancient mysteries. Look, however, at the passage Mr. Brown quoted. He began his citation thus—(see p. 379, 1st quotation:—

"Neither yet do we openly speak concerning them (that is, the mysteries) to the Catechumens; but we often speak many things covertly; in order that the faithful, who know them, may understand us, and in order that the Catechumens who may be ignorant of them may not be injured."

This is, I believe, the same passage, though the translation happens to be a little different. Now *what are the words that immediately precede it?*

"These mysteries," says St. Cyril, "the Church communicates to him who is quitting the class of the Catechumens. For it is not customary to reveal them to the heathens: nor do we propound to a heathen the mysteries concerning THE FATHER, and THE SON, and THE HOLY GHOST."



You perceive, therefore, that it was the mystery of THE TRINITY to which Cyril referred, as being, at least, the *principal* subject of secrecy; and when he had spoken what I have quoted, he then proceeds in the language which Mr. Brown adduced.

Mr. Brown attempts to establish the fact of Transubstantiation being held in the early Church, by referring to *the charges made against the primitive Christians* of their being in the habit of putting to death an infant, and devouring literal flesh and blood. He thinks they must have believed in the substantial presence of Christ in the Eucharist, else there would have been no foundation for such a charge. This charge, I reply, *might have originated in a misapprehension and perversion of the doctrine of the Eucharist as held by Protestants*, seeing the elements were called (as by Protestants) the body and blood of Christ, as well as from the fact of Transubstantiation being *literally* held. However, if we follow out the circumstance alluded to in its historical details, we shall see that so far from establishing Mr. B.'s position, it proves decidedly that the early Church did *not* believe in Transubstantiation. I shall give you the statement of this charge made upon the primitive Christians, and their answer, from a fragment of Irenæus which has been preserved by Œcumenius:—

“The Pagans, wishing to ascertain the secret ceremonial of the Christians, apprehended their slaves and put them to the torture. Impatient of the pain, and having nothing to tell which might please their tormentors, the slaves, who had heard their masters say that the Eucharist was the body and blood of Christ, forthwith communicated this circumstance. Whereupon the tormentors, fancying that it was literal blood and flesh which was served up in the mysteries of the Christians, hastened to inform the other Pagans. These immediately apprehended the martyrs, Sanctus and Blandina, and endeavoured to extort from them a confession of the deed. *But Blandina readily and boldly answered, How can those who through piety abstain even from lawful food, be capable of perpetrating the actions which you allege against them?*”—Iren. apud Œcum. in 1 Pet. ii. 12.

Here is the statement of the charge in the words of Irenæus; but when the martyrs were brought forward, and the charge preferred in their hearing, *they positively denied its truth*. This they could not have done *with strict veracity* if they believed that Christ's body and blood were *substantially* present in the Eucharist; therefore I conclude that *their denial of the charge, when thus made in connection with the celebration of the Eucharist*, involves the fact that *they could not have believed in Transubstantiation*.

At last, Sir, Mr. Brown has ventured to approach the

SACRIFICE OF THE MASS ; so that we have, *during almost the entire of two days out of three*, been engaged (so far, at least, as *the opposite side* is concerned), in what may be called *preliminary matter*! Mr. Edgeworth complained of my having constantly reprov'd our opponents for not coming to the Sacrifice of the Mass, which I asserted was the *main* point of discussion. I *do* say that it is the main point of discussion, and therefore it was not to be expected that it should have been deferred so long ; for, though it is true that the onus rested on the other side to *prove Transubstantiation*, and though, *without* such proof, they could not *really* succeed in establishing the Mass, yet you will recollect what I said in my last address (p. 341.)—that *even were I to grant Transubstantiation to be true*, I should still contend against, and strenuously object to, the Sacrifice of the Mass. We *might*, therefore, have had the subject sooner, but, I suppose, we must be satisfied that it has come to light *at last*.

My Rev. opponent has given us a definition of the term *sacrifice*, according to his view of it, and he has also restated the doctrine of the Church of Rome, as put forth by certain Roman Catholic writers. With respect to his definition of sacrifice I cannot admit it as an *accurate* one. First of all, it is said to be “*the oblation of a sensible thing*,” and therefore the definition is *not comprehensive enough* for the idea of sacrifice *in general* ; for though the term is *primarily* applied to *literal* sacrifices, yet it is oftentimes (as we shall see) applied to merely *spiritual* services, which would not be included by such a definition as Mr. B. has given. And then, secondly, even as a definition of a *literal* sacrifice it is not accurate, for it speaks only in a vague manner of “*some change of the victim* ;” whereas I have already shown you that, in a *literal* sacrifice, there must be *the actual destruction of the victim*. While, therefore, in the definition of a *literal* sacrifice we would consider (as my opponent has said) the “*matter as something sensible*,” and also declare, not merely “*some change*,” but *the destruction* of the victim, yet in the definition of sacrifice *in general*, as including *literal* and *spiritual* sacrifices, that given by Melancthon seems to be accurate and comprehensive.—(See Mr. B.'s speech, p. 380.)—Nor does Mr. B.'s objection to it from the passage in Hosea apply, because *mercy* there is *not opposed* to sacrifice *in general*, but to *literal* sacrifice, as the latter part of the verse (where the term “*burnt-offering*” occurs) declares. The meaning of the expression is, that God desired a spiritual service, or

the service of the heart, and not merely the service of external and literal sacrifice.

Requesting you *to bear in mind the arguments I have already adduced* against the Mass, especially from the Epistle to the Hebrews; and begging you also to remember not merely *Mr. B.'s* definition of the Mass, given by Roman Catholic *individuals* (see p. 381), but also *mine*, given from Roman Catholic *documents* (see p. 318, 319, and 342), I shall now read the passage from Malachi, in which members of the Church of Rome affect to find the Sacrifice of the Mass. It is contained in the 1st chapter, 10th and 11th verses:—

“ I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of Hosts: and I will not receive a gift of your hand. For *from the rising of the sun even to the going down*, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in *every place* there is *sacrifice*, and there is offered to my name *a clean oblation*: for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts.”

Now Mr. Brown, in making use of this passage, rests mainly on the *universality* of the offering spoken of, and on the *force of the terms employed*. He has given a variety of reasons why the sacrifice mentioned cannot have reference to that of *the cross*, which I am at once willing to *grant*; and he likewise contends that it cannot refer to merely *spiritual* sacrifices, by whatever name they may be called, which I beg leave *to dispute*.

I shall now investigate this portion of Scripture, and you will perceive my business is to show *that it does not of necessity apply to the Sacrifice of the Mass*.

I. Mr. Brown rests on the term “ *sacrifice*” (as it is translated in the Roman Catholic version), or “ *incense*” (as it is in the Protestant), as intimating a *literal* sacrifice, which, inasmuch as it cannot be that of *the cross*, must, he says, be that of *the Mass*. Now *Mr. B.'s* part is to prove that it *must* refer to the Mass; whereas, if *I* prove that it *may not*, I shall have done *sufficient*. I contend, then, that we have no right to argue from the simple use of the term *sacrifice* in this passage that it *must* mean *the sacrifice of the Mass*. This would be a most extraordinary conclusion. I remember in other places of Scripture (and Mr. Brown has hinted at this), that *prayer* is called a sacrifice—that *praise* is called a sacrifice—that a “ *broken and contrite spirit*,” and that the *bodies of believers*, devoted to the service of God, are said to be sacrifices to God. How do we therefore stand? If Mr. Brown contends that, because *the word sacrifice* is used in this passage, it *must of necessity* mean the Sacrifice of the Mass, upon the very

same principle I might argue that prayer was the Sacrifice of the Mass—that praise was the Sacrifice of the Mass—and that the bodies of believers constituted the Sacrifice of the Mass; for *all these things* are called *sacrifices* as well as the offering spoken of in the passage of Malachi. It is impossible, therefore, to deduce a *positive* argument in favour of the Sacrifice of the Mass, simply from the use of the *term* sacrifice, seeing that that term is applied to *many other* things in Scripture beside *literal* sacrifices.

II. Let us come to the other expression, “*a clean oblation*,” or a “*pure offering*,” as it is in the Protestant Bible. Mr. Brown thinks this also proves the Sacrifice of the Mass; but looking at the term I contend that it does not *necessarily* prove *literal* sacrifice at all. Until, therefore, Mr. Brown demonstrates *that the word is confined to the notion of a literal sacrifice* (and not merely that such is its *usual* signification, even if that were the case), he has manifestly proved *nothing to the purpose*, for as long as the word *may* have another signification, his argument for a literal sacrifice derived from it cannot be *conclusive*. On the other hand, if I can show you that the term is positively applied to *other things* besides literal sacrifices, then I shall have sufficiently invalidated my opponent's argument that the term must *of necessity* apply to the Mass. Look, then, at the 66th chapter of Isaiah, and you will read thus in part of the 19th and 20th verses:—

“And they shall declare my glory to the Gentiles: and they shall bring *all your brethren* out of all nations *for a gift* to the Lord,” &c.

The word which is here translated *a gift* (and which manifestly means a simple offering, or dedication, and not a literal sacrifice), is *the same term* which is translated *oblation* in Malachi; and this proves that the term is *not confined* to the idea of a *literal* sacrifice, but that sometimes it simply signifies *a gift* or *an offering*.

III. The fact of *universality* spoken of in the text does not prove that it has reference to the Sacrifice of the Mass, for although Mr. B. has boasted of the extent of Roman Catholicism, *that sacrifice has never yet been* (but much the contrary, if you consider the great extent of Heathenism) *universal*, and I may venture to add, as my own opinion, *that it never will be*.

IV. Thus we see that my Rev. antagonist has by no means positive proof that this passage refers to the Mass, for I have shown you that at least it *may* be otherwise. Now,

in a disputation, the individual who supports the *negative*, does quite enough if he shows that his adversary *has not established his point*. He is not called upon, unless he pleases, to produce *affirmative* arguments. Since, therefore, I have pointed out that this passage *does not necessarily support the Mass*, I am not called on to point out *what it does support*. However, I may observe, before I leave the consideration of it, that I think it refers to *spiritual sacrifices*, by whatever different names they may be called. Most of Mr. B.'s objections to this view will find an answer in substance, though not in form, in what I have already stated. I would only add, that, according to the language of this passage, those spiritual services may well be called *sacrifices*, for they are often so called in Scripture (as I have shown)—they may well be called a *clean oblation* or *offering*, for although *in themselves* (as Mr. Brown says of good works) they are not pure, yet, in every sincere believer in Christ, they are accepted *not in themselves*, but perfumed and purified by the Redeemer's merit, which is "the altar that sanctifies the gift"—and such spiritual sacrifices also accord well with the language of the prophecy, that they shall be offered "*in every place*;" for we know that the time is coming when "*the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea.*"

V. I would only observe further with respect to this passage (as we have heard a great deal to-day about the Fathers, and as our opponents lay such stress on their authority), that I have before me several quotations from the Fathers, commenting on, or introducing, this passage, and *giving the very same interpretation as Protestants give*. For example, Tertullian, when writing against Marcion, says,—

"In the Church the Lord God is blessed: as the prophet Malachi expresses it, 'In all places a pure offering;' namely, *glorifying and blessing him with prayers and hymns*. A pure offering, as Malachi says, is *an honest prayer from a pure conscience*."—Cont. Marc. lib. 3.

Such was Tertullian's mode of understanding the passage. Theodoret, whose name has been already mentioned to-day, says, in commenting on this chapter:—

"By incense and pure offering *we are to understand the knowledge and worship of God*, as our Lord said to the woman of Samaria, (John iv. 23.) 'But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall *worship the Father in spirit and in truth*.' And the Apostle (1 Tim. ii. 8.) 'I will therefore that men *pray everywhere*, lifting up holy hands, without wrath or doubting.'"—Theod. in Mal. i. 10.

I have several other quotations to the same effect, but I shall give only one short extract more from Jerome, for I do not think the testimony absolutely *essential*, and only advert to it briefly, in order to shew that, *were it really necessary to produce it, we are not so destitute of this species of testimony as our opponents would pretend*. Jerome says, when giving his comment on this passage :—

“ The Prophet teaches that the prayers of holy men should be offered to the Lord, not only in the single province of Judea, to which the sacrifices were confined, but in every place.”—Jerom. in Mal. i. 10, 11.

Here he interprets the passage as speaking of the prayers of holy men.

The prophecy of Malachi is *the only* portion of Scripture that has been *as yet* adduced by Mr. Brown in defence of the Sacrifice of the Mass. He hinted at another just before he sat down, but had not time to bring it out in form. We shall therefore look anxiously for some additional proof to-morrow.

When I last spoke, I produced a number of passages, especially from the Epistle to the Hebrews, which seemed to me to overthrow this doctrine of the propitiatory nature of the Sacrifice of the Mass. I think I closed my address with the consideration of the opening of the 10th chapter of that Epistle, where the Apostle argues that *the repetition or continuation of a sacrifice argued its imperfection, &c.* Therefore I maintained that the existence of the Sacrifice of the Mass, which is called “ a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice,” *practically argued the insufficiency of Christ's sacrifice* on the Cross, and argued, in addition thereto, *its own* insufficiency. Now, Sir, I shall call your attention to the same chapter at the 10th verse :—

“ In the which will (the will of God) we are sanctified by the oblation of the body of Jesus Christ **ONCE**.”

I request you to mark again in this place what I so frequently adverted to, namely, the remarkable fact that the Apostle, all through this Epistle, *is constantly using the term ONCE*, as if to guard against the possibility of any thing starting up in the primitive Church, or in future ages, like a *repetition or continuation* of the Sacrifice on Calvary. Farther, in the 11th and following verses we read :—

“ And every priest (i. e. of the Levitical dispensation) indeed standeth *duily ministering, and often offering the same sacrifices*, which can never take away sins: but this man (Jesus) offering **ONE SACRIFICE FOR SINS**, for ever sitteth on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting until his enemies be made his footstool. **FOR BY ONE OBLATION HE HATH PERFECTED FOR EVER** them that are sanctified.”



Observe here, 1st, *the contrast* that is drawn between the offering of Christ and that of the Jewish priests. They stood “*daily* ministering (my friends, there are *others* to whom this description is strikingly applicable) and *often offering* the same sacrifices, which could never take away sin.” But on the contrary it is said of Christ, “This man offering *one sacrifice for sins*, for ever sitteth on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting until his enemies be made his footstool.”

2ndly. Take notice of *the reason why he offered but one sacrifice*, and did not ordain a *continuation* of it. It is found in the simple fact of *the perfection of the one that he had offered*:—“For by *one oblation*”—nothing about continuation or repetition—“he hath *perfected*”—and has he perfected *for a time only*? No—but “he hath perfected *for ever* them that are sanctified.” If then, Sir, the testimony of the Bible thus comes to me, and tells me that Christ has offered *one sacrifice* for sin—and that by this one oblation he hath *perfected for ever* them that are sanctified—shall I be engaged in ministering, as the Jewish priests of old, in the offering up of a repetition or continuation of that sacrifice, or shall I not rather take refuge with my whole heart in **THE ONE OFFERING** which alone can bring peace and pardon to my soul?

There is one more passage that I shall cite from this chapter, the 18th verse:—

“Now *where there is a remission of these* (that is, *sins*, for in the previous verse it is declared ‘their sins and iniquities I will remember no more’) **THERE IS NO MORE AN OBLATION FOR SIN.**”

We find there is remission of sin even for the guiltiest in the atonement and satisfaction of Christ. Yes, whatever be the plans that human wisdom and ingenuity could devise, the testimony of God stands still firm and immutable, that “**THE BLOOD OF JESUS CHRIST CLEANSETH FROM ALL SIN,**” 1 John i. 7. If so, the Apostle tells us “**THERE IS NO MORE AN OBLATION FOR SIN.**” Where then, I ask, is the Scriptural authority for the sacrifice offered up continually in this Chapel, and in other places in the different quarters of the globe?

I shall not dwell further on the subject to-day, but shall conclude with expressing my earnest prayer that the Lord may lead each one of you into the acknowledgment and belief of “**THE TRUTH AS IT IS IN JESUS.**”



SIXTH DAY.—*Friday, March 7th, 1834.*

---

SUBJECT:  
THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS (*continued*).

---

THE CHAIRMAN took his seat at the usual hour.

THE REV. T. J. BROWN.

MR. CHAIRMAN; Ladies and Gentlemen,—I have to resume my address to you by an exposure either of *bad faith* on the part of the champions of Protestantism, or of *ignorance*. You may recollect that yesterday Mr. Lyons cited from “The Apostolical Constitutions,” a prayer addressed to priests at the time of their ordination, from the language of which prayer he directed you to conclude, that the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass was not held at the time when those Constitutions were written. I have the Apostolical Constitutions before me, in Cotelierius’s edition of the “Patres Apostolici,” and shall quote from the same prayer, p. 407. The Rev. Gentleman read the *first* part of the prayer; I wish to call his attention to its *last* part, observing that he ought to have quoted the *whole* prayer if he intended any except a mere captious argument to be brought from it, against the Catholic doctrine. The conclusion of the prayer is in these words—

“Grant, O Lord, that he (the newly ordained priest) may serve thee with a pure mind and willing soul, and that, through thy Christ, *he may accomplish immaculate sacrifices for the people.*” Τας ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ ἱεροουργίας ἀμωμούς ἐκτελῇ.

The Greek text is as decisive as any thing that Mr. Lyons can require.

Moreover, in order to establish yet more decisively, that in the Apostolical Constitutions occur the terms *oblation* and *sacrifice*, and that they are therein expressed as clearly as in our Ritual of these times, I appeal to “the Invocation at the Ordination of the Bishops,” in chap.

v. book viii. A little beyond the middle of that chapter I find in the prayer offered for the Bishop at the time of Consecration, the following words:—

“ May he be pleasing to thee in meekness and clean heart, continually, blamelessly, and irreprehensibly, offering up to thee the pure and unbloody Sacrifice, which, through Christ, thou hast appointed, the Mystery of the New Testament.”—καθαραν και αναιμακτον θυσιαν—το μυστηριον της καινης διαθηκης.

I might refer Mr. L. to another place in the Apostolical Constitutions, respecting the duty of priests. In the 4th book, chap. 20th, at the concluding part of the chapter, are these words:—

“ Let the priest teach, offer, baptize, and bless the people.”

You now, I trust, think with me, that Mr. Lyons ought to have read to the end of that chapter, from which he affected to quote against us. These “ Apostolical Constitutions,” I should observe, are works of very great antiquity. They were not written, it is true, by the Apostles, but are certainly of very early origin. They profess to contain the doctrines delivered by tradition in the first ages of Christianity, and were committed to writing so soon as the cessation of “ the Discipline of the Secret” permitted that the forms of the sacred rites might be published.

I regret to say, that I have a somewhat similar reproach, of unfair quotations, to make against Mr. Tottenham. He had previously told us, that Fathers were opposed to Fathers, and my reply has been, and still is, that neither were the Fathers opposed to each other on *points of Catholic belief*, nor to us, in any of those matters where we differ from the Protestants of the present day. Mr. Tottenham did, however, adduce passages from some of the Fathers, to show that they rejected the explanation I gave of the prediction of Malachi. He first quoted Tertullian from his 3rd book against Marcion. The passage occurs, however, in the 4th book; not that this is a mistake of much consequence except to myself, as it occasioned me to lose a large portion of my time in endeavouring to discover the quotation in the original.

It occurs in the 1st chapter of the 4th book.

“ Non est voluntas mea in vobis, inquit Dominus, et Sacrificia non excipiam de manibus vestris; quoniam a solis ortu usque ad occasum glorificatum est in nationibus nomen meum, et in omni loco Sacrificium nomini meo offertur, et Sacrificium mundum, scilicet simplex oratio de conscientia pura.”

Tertullian is here quoting from the 1st chap. of Malachi, ver. 10 and 11, which, according to his version, concludes

thus :—" And in every place sacrifice is offered to my name, and a clean sacrifice ;" " that is," says he, " an honest prayer from a good conscience." On these last words the Rev. Gentleman raised his objection. I maintain that Mr. T. did not read, with attention, the passage, or he would have observed that in the text of Malachi, there are two terms relating to sacrifice, rendered in your English version, "*incense*," and "*a pure offering*." I have before observed that the Hebrew term "*Quether*," which is named, in the Protestant Bible, "*incense*," expresses " sacrifice," as well as "*incense*." Tertullian, therefore, who follows this interpretation, is only explaining the *first* term of the prediction, namely, "*incense*," or "*sacrifice*," and *in reference to that alone*, he expounds " sacrifice" to be " an honest prayer from a good conscience:" but he does not, in this place, give an explanation of the *second* term of the prediction—" *a pure offering*." However, in other parts of his works, there are frequent occasions whereon he speaks of "*altars and oblations*."

In the next place, Mr. Tottenham urged the exposition of St. Jerome, as referring the prediction of Malachi to the prayers of holy men. Now I will read to you the whole of St. Jerome's comment on the passage in question, and you will then be able to judge whether it bears out Mr. Tottenham's position.

" It is a fixed rule," says he, " that when a prophecy manifestly refers to future events, we are *not to weaken it by uncertain allegories*. The present prophecy regards the Jewish Priests, who brought improper victims to be offered, to signify to them, that spiritual victims would succeed to carnal, and that not the blood of bulls and goats, but *perfumes, that is the prayers of the Saints*, should be offered to God."

So far Mr. T. *seems to be* right ; but he ought to have read, (as Mr. Lyons should have done, when he quoted from the Apost. Constitutions) the whole of the context.—Immediately after those words—" Not the blood of bulls and goats, but perfumes, that is, the prayers of the Saints should be offered to God,"—St. Jerome goes on thus:—

" *And that, not in one province, nor in one city : but a clean oblation in every place, such as is offered in the Christian ceremonies* :—for from the rising of the sun 'till the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles."

Here, then, the *two* distinct terms of the prophecy are both referred to, and explained ; whereas, Mr. T. having cited St. Jerome's exposition of the *first* of them only, stopped short, and left you to suppose that it was the *whole of the explanation* which the holy Doctor gave of Malachi's prediction.

The third authority adduced was from Theodoret. I have not that part of Theodoret's works to which my opponent refers; but I have this morning seen in three publications by distinguished authors, Sardagna, Tournely, and Bellarmine, that Theodoret makes the same application of Malachi's prophecy as St. Jerome does, explaining the *first* part of *good works*; but from the *second* part, deducing a clear proof of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, in the Christian dispensation.

The authority of the Fathers Mr. Tottenham affected to undervalue; and at the same time he signified that he could bring them against us in vast array. I beg, however, to tell him, what, I believe, he well knows, that all the passages he could produce are merely *obscure passages*; and I heretofore assigned a reason why, if the Fathers believed, as we believe, regarding the real presence and sacrifice of Christ on Christian altars, they ought, in their *public* discourses and writings, to be *purposely* obscure, on account of the Discipline of the Secret: and, although Mr. T. pretends that the secret referred principally to the Trinity, yet he admitted that it included the Eucharist and the Sacrifice of the Altar, and Christian Mysteries in general. By this Discipline, the Fathers *were bound to be obscure* in such of their books as were designed for *general inspection*; but, for the same reason, they were *obliged*, on other occasions, to *expound without any obscurity*, viz. to the new Christians, what were the real doctrines of Christian Revelation. We are to look, therefore, to their catechetical discourses for the true meaning of the Fathers. Accordingly, my quotations were taken from these; and, in them you find no obscurity, no affected concealment. Not only do the Fathers express clearly, that *the body and blood of Christ are present*, but they explicitly declare that *a real change takes place*; that *what was before bread, is no longer bread*; and that *what was wine before, is no longer wine*; that the *Bread is changed into the body of Christ*, and the *Wine is changed into the blood of Christ*. If Mr. T. has a single passage from any of the *catechetical discourses*, which will support *his* doctrine against me, he is called upon to produce it.

Mr. T. made use of an artful attempt to deceive those to whom he addressed himself. He alleged the authority of Roffensis, Scotius, Cajetan, and several others, who, as Bellarmine testifies, were unable to discover *Transubstantiation* in the Scripture. But was it here that the

impression resulting from Mr. T.'s argument was designed to stop? Is it not evident that he sought to confound *Transubstantiation* with *the substantial presence of Christ* in the Sacrament; and thereby to insinuate that those Catholic Divines, whom he cited, confessed that they could not see, in *the Scriptures*, proofs of such substantial presence? If he did mean this, he labours under a grievous error; for *not one* of those who found a difficulty in discovering *clear evidence of Scripture*, in support of *Transubstantiation*, extend any such difficulty to *the other mystery*.

Mr. T. said, likewise, that the quotations which had been adduced from the Fathers, prove no more than what Protestants are willing to admit; namely, the true and real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, which the Fathers call the Lord's Body and Blood, just as Protestants are willing to call it. Really, I do not know whether Mr. T. thought it worth while to attend to our quotations, but they went much farther than he represents. I will recall them to his attention. You may recollect, that I quoted the following, from the 4th Mystagogical discourse of St. Cyril of Jerusalem:

"Jesus Christ, once, in Cana of Galilee, *changed water into wine* by his will alone; and shall we think it less worthy of credit, *that he changed wine into his blood*?—Invited to an earthly marriage, he wrought this miracle, and shall we hesitate to confess that he has given to his children his body to eat, and his blood to drink? Wherefore, with all confidence, let us take the body and blood of Christ. For, under the type or figure of bread, his body is given to them; and, under the figure of wine, his blood is given; that so being made partakers of the body and blood of Christ, you may become one body and one blood with him. . . . Wherefore, I conjure you, my brethren, not to consider them any more as common bread and wine, since they are the body and blood of Jesus Christ, according to his words: and although your sense might suggest that to you, let faith confirm you. Judge not of the thing by your taste, but by faith assure yourself, without the least doubt, that you are honoured with the body and blood of Christ. This knowing, and of this being assured, *that what appears to you bread, is not bread, but the body of Christ, although the taste judges it to be bread; and that the wine which you see, and which has the taste of wine, is not wine, but his blood!*"

Is this merely declaring that the body of Christ is present, *as Protestants* acknowledge it? St. Gregory of Nyssa, in his long Discourse, addressed not to the Catechumens, but their instructors, the Catechists, Tom. 2. cap. 37, p. 537. Ed. Par. 1615—says,

"By virtue of the benediction, the nature of *visible things* is *changed* into his body. . . . And so I now believe that the *bread*, sanctified by the word of God, *is transformed and changed* into the body of Christ."

St. Ambrose in his Book "*de Initiandes*," Tom. 4, c. 9, p. 350, 351, Paris, 1614, teaches the newly baptized, that

“by the benediction *nature itself is changed.*” After reminding them of the change (as I read yesterday) of the rod of Aaron into a serpent, and subsequently back again into a rod, he goes on to tell them, that

“If the blessing of man be powerful enough to *change nature*, what must we not say of the divine consecration? For the sacrament which you receive is accomplished by the word of Christ. If the word of Elias could call down fire from heaven, shall not the word of Christ be able to *change the nature of created things*? If the word of Christ could draw out of nothing what till then had no existence, shall it not be able to *change the things that exist, into that which they are not*?”

If these quotations shall not be thought sufficient, I will produce many others to the same purpose: but I really have not time to lose unnecessarily upon a point which is as clear as the day-light. For the present, therefore, I content myself with calling your attention to the authority of an eminent Protestant divine, and bishop, who acknowledges that the Fathers did frequently speak of a *true and substantial change*. This Protestant writer, Dr. Samuel Parker, in his work entitled, “Reasons for abrogating the Test,” (p. 13) states:—

“It is evident to all men that are but ordinarily conversant in ecclesiastical learning, that the ancient fathers, from age to age asserted the *real and substantial* presence in very high and expressive terms.”

He then recites the terms used by the Greek Fathers, all of which are strongly expressive of a substantial change; also the corresponding terms used by the Latin Fathers, which, he says, are “agreeable with the Greeks, Conversion, Transmutation, Transfiguration, Transelementation, and at length, Transubstantiation; by all which,” continues this Protestant Bishop, “they expressed nothing more nor less than the *real and substantial presence* in the Eucharist.” He goes on (p. 62) to censure some who had departed from the true and real doctrine of the Church of England, and concludes:—(p. 65, 66.)

“If they own a *real presence*, we see from the premises how little the controversy is between that and Transubstantiation, as it is truly and ingenuously understood by all the reformed Churches. If they do not, they disown the doctrine both of the Church of England, and the Church Catholick; and then, if they own only a figurative presence (and it is plain they own no other), they stand condemned of Heresie by almost all the Churches in the Christian world: and if this be the thing pretended to be set up (as it certainly is by the authors and contrivers of it), by renouncing Transubstantiation, then the result and bottom of the law is, under this pretence, to bring a new Heresie by law into the Church of England.”

That, I repeat, is the testimony of a Protestant Bishop, of Oxford, Dr. Samuel Parker.

Mr. Tottenham has owned that under the Discipline of the Secret several particulars are included, although he contended that it had reference chiefly to the Trinity.

This is sufficient for my purpose ; but had he not made this avowal, I could have adduced sufficient proofs to have shown not only that the real and substantial presence of Christ in the Eucharist, was an object of the Discipline of the Secret : but, that this, and the Sacrifice of the Mass were *its principal objects*. But here Mr. T. presumed to say that *he had caught us*, as we had caught him, in mangling the texts of the Fathers. He reproached me with not having gone far enough back in my quotations from St. Cyril, or I should have found that he did apply the principle of the Secret to the doctrine of the Trinity. Well ; I am willing to accompany Mr. T. as far back as he has gone for his quotation. Do I understand Mr. T. to say that his translation differs from mine ? I will first read mine ; and if it be disputed, he may appoint to compare it with the original, any Greek scholars whom he may choose to name ; and I will name others on my side.

“ Just so the church *discovers its sacraments* to those who leave the class of Catechumens :—(He is here speaking of the discovery of the object of the Secret :) *for we declare not to the Gentiles the hidden mysteries of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.*”

From this Mr. T. wished you to understand that *the belief* of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were the hidden mysteries contained under the Discipline of the Secret. According to my interpretation of the passage, those words refer not to *a belief in* the Trinity, but of certain hidden mysteries of the Christian religion, revealed by the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

I cannot pass by a grievous charge brought against my friend Mr. Edgeworth, by Mr. T., of suppressing a most important part of the dialogue of Theodoret. My Reverend friend has assured me, and I cannot question such assurance, that he did not pass over any portion of the dialogue in question, *for the purpose* of suppressing any thing therein. But I will, moreover, show you that the very part which he did not quote, contains something more decisive than the preceding words that he had quoted, in favour of the Roman Catholic doctrine. I shall not, for want of time, read from the dialogue at length, but I will call your attention to the most important portion of that which was cited, and afterwards to that which Mr. T. omitted to cite. First, observe, Theodoret declares that there is a mystery, which he will not reveal :—

“ Tell me, therefore,” says Eranistes, “ what do you call the gift that is offered before the priest’s invocation ?” Orthodoxos.—“ This must not be said openly ; for some may be present who are not initiated !”



Hereby, he prepares us for a certain *studied obscurity*. Next, he speaks of the symbols *before* and *after* consecration.

Now, if I did not misunderstand Mr. T., he confounded Theodoret's doctrine concerning the symbols *after* consecration, with what he says of them *before* consecration;—Eranistes having asked, "How do you call," &c., goes on thus—

"As the symbols of the body and blood of Christ were different *before* the consecration of the priest, and *after* the consecration are changed, in the same manner we (the Eutychians) say, the body of Christ after his ascension was changed into the divine essence."

We now come to the part which Mr. Tottenham says that Mr. Edgeworth omitted:—

"Thou art taken in thine own net; for, after the consecration, the mystical symbols lose not their proper nature; they remain in the former substance, and shape, and appearance."

Hence Mr. Tottenham argues, that Transubstantiation, or a change of substance was believed not to take place. He ought, however, to know, for it has been confessed by the most eminent of Protestant controversialists, by Claude, in his answer to Nouet, p. 476, by Aubertin "*Eucharistie de l'Ancienne Eglise*," p. 787, and others, that the Fathers understood frequently by the words *substance* and *nature*, not what *we now* understand thereby, but the *external and visible qualities* of a thing. This they prove by several examples, to which I could add many others. There is no necessity, however, of my doing so, as Mr. Tottenham is not, I presume, ignorant of the fact: but if he wishes it, I will lay them before you, for I have them prepared.

But what did Mr. Tottenham suppress? A most important part of the passage. He charged my friend, the Rev. Mr. Edgeworth with having omitted that which *we can easily show to be unessential*, whilst he himself has omitted that to which he will find it extremely difficult to give a solution. I should observe, here, that the translation which Mr. Tottenham gave of this passage, is not the certain meaning of the Greek text; for, it is interpreted by many Greek scholars, not as he renders it:—"the mystical symbols remain in their former *substance*, figure, and appearance," but—"in the shape and form of the former *substance*." Theodoret adds:—

"They are understood to be what they have been made; this they are believed to be; and as such they ARE ADORED."

These last words, which Mr. Tottenham omitted, are a

most important testimony in favour of our doctrine. I will conclude this subject, by referring Mr. T. for one moment, to the authority of a celebrated Protestant Theologian, whose comment upon the language of Theodoret, confirms the explanation which, in the first instance, I proposed. The justly celebrated Leibnitz, in his *Systema Theologicum*, p. 227, writes thus:—

“Gelasius, the Roman Pontiff, gives us to understand, that the bread is changed into the body of Christ, whilst the nature of the bread remains; *he means its qualities or accidents*. For in those days they did not express themselves with perfect precision and metaphysical accuracy. *In the same sense Theodoret says, that in this change, which he calls μεταβολη, the mystic symbols are not deprived of their proper nature.*”

Here we have Leibnitz confessing that Theodoret means by the term *nature*, (or *substance*, for among the ancients these terms were indifferently used,) not what we metaphysically and correctly now understand thereby, but qualities or accidents.

One word more in answer to another objection which has been urged. Mr. T. brought forward the history of Blandina, recorded by St. Irenæus, as disproving that the ancient Christians believed in Transubstantiation, or the real presence. I will, therefore, read the fragment of Irenæus, which preserves that history, and you will see whether Blandina denied the real presence in the sense *in which we understand it*; or whether she merely denied the *carnal and sensible manner* of eating the flesh of Christ, *in which the Capernaïtes understood* his words, when he promised to them his flesh and blood. The fragment in question has been preserved by Œcumenius, and was, I believe, first cited against the Catholic doctrine by Archbishop Tillotson:—

“When the Greeks had taken some slaves of the Christian Catechumens (that is, such as had not been admitted to the sacrament), and afterwards urged them by violence to tell them some of the secrets of the Christians, these slaves having nothing to say that might gratify those who offered violence to them, except, only, that they had heard from their masters that the *divine communion* was the blood and body of Christ; *they, thinking that it was really blood and flesh*, declared as much to those who questioned them. The Greeks taking this, as if it were really done by the Christians, discovered it to others of the Greeks, who, hereupon, put Sanctus and Blandina to the torture, to make them confess it. To whom Blandina boldly answered, ‘How could they endure to do this, who by way of exercise (or abstinence) do not eat that flesh which may lawfully be eaten.’”

The answer of Blandina naturally should correspond with the question proposed. Now, the question was, whether the Christians did that which was calumniously asserted of them, that they ate and drank *human flesh and blood after a carnal manner*; for it was said, as I think I told you yesterday, that they devoured children

in their solemn worship ; Blandina answered, according to the meaning of this question, that they did *not eat flesh and drink blood*.

It is, therefore, unjust to say that she denied the reality of Christ's presence, understood after the manner of the Catholic belief ; or, after any other manner than that only, in which the Pagans understood it.

Mr. Tottenham replied to my exposition of Malachi, that by "pure offering," was meant, *the works of those who have genuine faith*, which, though not pure of themselves, are pure through Christ. But does he not remember that I answered, by anticipation, this objection ? I observed that *the Jews* had genuine faith, and that they had good works. I think the Rev. gentleman will not be disposed to deny this, after he shall have looked (as I suppose he has often done,) into the 11th chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the faith of many holy Jews is highly extolled ; and as faith is the foundation of good works, I believe my opponent holds that where there is *pure faith*, there are good works. These Jews, I imagine, had as much of genuine faith as Mr. Tottenham will assert—that any have now a-days ; *this*, therefore, was not the future sacrifice which Malachi predicted :—it remains, consequently, in confirmation of my argument, that what he predicted was, the oblation or sacrifice of the Catholic Christian dispensation.

Mr. Tottenham urged against me a passage from Isaiah, chap. lxvi. ver. 19, 20, where the word *Minehah*, or *Mincha*, is not understood literally, but figuratively. I thought, that I had answered yesterday, the difficulties about figures. Figurative language must be judged of by its circumstances, and by the sense of the context : and where there is danger of error, language is not to be understood figuratively. Now, the prophet Malachi is opposing the sacrifice that was to be offered *in future ages* to the sacrifices *of the Jews*. As then, the sacrifices of the Jews were *literal* sacrifices, so the sacrifice *which he predicts*, was to be a *literal* sacrifice.

The remaining objections I will notice before the close of the discussion ; but I must go on now with my arguments, as my time is drawing to a close, and it will be said that I have furnished nothing to be answered.

I invite your attention to my third proof,—the figures in the *old* law, of the sacrifice of the *new* ; and principally to that of the Paschal Lamb. The Paschal lamb was decidedly, and indisputably, a figure of Christ. In 1 Cor. chap. v. 7, Christ is called, "our passover." Now, this

type of Christ in the old law, according to its mysterious circumstances, is fulfilled by the sacrifice of *the mass*, not by *the sacrifice of the cross*. For, first, the mysterious circumstance of the consumption of the Paschal Lamb *in the evening*, we see fulfilled in the New Testament, where Christ *in the evening* declared ; “ This is my body which is broken for you,”—“ this is my blood which is shed for you.” On the other hand, we know it was *not in the evening* that the sacrifice of *the cross* was offered, but *at mid-day*. The Paschal Lamb was offered in *commemoration* of the passage of the angel, and the liberation of the Israelites. The mass is likewise offered in *commemoration* of the true passage of the Saviour of Israel from mortality to immortality ; whereas, in no sense was the sacrifice of the cross offered in commemoration, but it is commemorated to this day in the sacrifice of our altars. Thirdly, In the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb, *the victim* was eaten *truly* and *not figuratively* ; in the sacrifice of the Mass, *the victim* is *truly eaten*, but the victim as sacrificed on the cross could not be eaten. Fourthly, The sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb could be eaten only by those who were *circumcised* :—so the sacrifice of the Christian, the sacrifice upon our altars, can be received by those only who are spiritually circumcised, that is, who are *cleansed and pure* ; but the sacrifice of the cross was for *all* mankind. Therefore the figurative circumstances, I contend, attendant upon the *Paschal Lamb*, were fully completed in the sacrifice of the Mass, and *not in the sacrifice of the cross*, consequently, the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb, being a figure of Christ sacrificed, was the figure of him as he is offered in the sacrifice of *the mass*, not as he is offered in the sacrifice of *the cross*.

A fourth argument to which I now call your attention, is the words of the Institution of the Lord's Supper, Luke chap. 22, ver. 19, 20 :—

“ He,” (Jesus) “ took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is *given* for you : *this do in remembrance of me*. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This is the New Testament in my blood which is *shed* for you.” 1 Cor. chap. xi. ver. 24, “ And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take eat : *this is my body which is broken* for you ; *this do in remembrance of me*.” Matt. chap. 26, ver. 28 ; “ For *this is my blood* of the New Testament, which is *shed* for the remission of sins.”

I maintain that by these words spoken by Christ, at *his last Supper*, was instituted *a true sacrifice*. There we have a true sacrifice, where is an offering of a victim to God,

with an *effusion of blood*. But in the text I quoted just now from St. Luke, there is express mention made of an *oblation, and an effusion of blood*. “This is *my body given for you, this is the New Testament in my blood which is shed for you.*” In the other passages which I adduced, we find a similar language recorded by the inspired writers. Now, this giving, or offering of the body, and shedding of the blood of Christ, here mentioned, apply not to the sacrifice of *the cross*, nor to a *presentation to the apostles* of the mere figure of Christ in the bread and wine.—Not to a *mere presentation* of the figure of Christ in the bread and wine *to the apostles*, who alone were present, for it is not said (St. Matthew, chap. 26, ver. 28,) “This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you,” but, “*for many, for the remission of sins.*” (St. Luke xxii. 19,) “This is my body which is given to you,” but, “*for you.*”—It does not refer to the sacrifice of *the cross*: for, first, the sacrifice of the cross was to take place *afterwards*, and the words are of the *present time*: “This is my body, which is given for you: This is my blood, which is shed for you.” I shall be told that in our version we do not read *is*, but *shall be*. Protestants, however, have not a right to call in question the reading of their own version of the Scripture, from which I quote, especially as in this place it literally corresponds with the original Greek. Secondly, Christ says: “*This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you.*” Now, the *cup* can have no connexion with the sacrifice of the cross; but it has with the Eucharist. Christ adds:—“This do in remembrance of me.” But it is not the sacrifice of the *cross* which we are to repeat *in remembrance* of Christ; it can be, therefore, only the sacrifice of the Eucharist, which the apostles and their successors are ordered to offer, as the ministers of Christ, *in remembrance* of him, in remembrance of the sacrifice he once offered upon the cross.

I proceed to another argument founded upon 1 Cor. chap. x. ver. 18—21:

“Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of *the sacrifices* partakers of the altar? What say I then? that the idol is anything, or that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is anything? But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of *the Lord's table, and the table of devils.*”

We find here that the *cup* of the Lord, and the *table* of

the *Lord*, are put in opposition to the *cup of devils*, and the *table of devils*. We know, moreover, that upon the *table of devils* were offered true oblations, *literal sacrifices*: consequently, when to the cup of devils, and the table of devils the apostle opposes the *cup of the Lord*, and the *table of the Lord*, for the argument to be good, there must be, in either case, a reality of substance in the victims offered; that is, as there was a *true and literal oblation* upon the *table of devils*, so there must be a *true and literal oblation* upon the *altars* of the Christian dispensation. To confirm my reasoning, I may have recourse to a work written by a member of the Reformation Society, which is so far at least of authority, as his argument is supported by Scripture. I find Mr. Shanks, in his translation of "the Anatomy of the Mass," to which he has prefixed certain observations of his own, I find him stating at p. 23, that there is a *real sacrifice* pointed out by the apostle in the words adduced:—

"The apostle," says he, "contrasts the table of the Lord, and the table of devils, putting them in direct opposition to each other. Ye cannot drink of the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils; ye cannot eat of the table of the Lord and the table of devils." He had just before said, "That the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils." The things sacrificed, are, therefore, the same with the meat-offerings, and drink-offerings signified by the cup and the table of devils. *In like manner*, the meat-offerings, and drink-offerings, signified by the cup and the table of the Lord, were also *sacrifices in the apostles' estimation*; otherwise, the contrast he has instituted is greatly defective. As the meat-offerings, and drink-offerings presented upon the table of devils, were sacrifices, so were the bread and wine upon the table of the Lord; and, consequently, these were called oblation or sacrifice."

You hear Mr. Shanks declaring that, in the text which I have quoted, there is designated a *true and literal sacrifice in the new law*. If there be a true and *literal sacrifice*, what other, then, can that sacrifice be, *but the sacrifice of the mass*?

REV. J. LYONS.

I WOULD not have risen thus early in the meeting to-day, were it not for the same cause that obliged me to speak at the same time on the last day of the past week. I am under the necessity of returning immediately to fulfil my own ministerial duty in a distant place; and, therefore, I now occupy the place of Mr. Tottenham.

There were some remarks read yesterday by Mr. Brown, from a work of Mr. G. Stanley Faber, but as they merely applied to myself as an individual, I will not take any farther notice of them. There were some others from a work by Dr. Samuel Clarke, when writing on the Attributes of God, also directed personally, I also pass these over in the same manner.

I now pass to the consideration of some remarks made by Mr. Brown on the subject under discussion. He commented upon a quotation I made yesterday from the Apostolical Constitutions. I think he must have mistaken when he said that I did not read down to the end of the passage. *I read the whole passage, and then translated it.* I read beyond the Greek word, *ιερουρυιας*. But Mr. Brown says, that the translation of the word ought to be, “doing sacrifice.” If I have made a mistake in the translation of this word *ιερουρυιας*, by rendering it as meaning *spiritual services*, I have erred, in what Mr. Brown must acknowledge to be good company—that is, with a copy of the *Vulgate Bible*, brought out by Clement the Eighth, in which the same Greek word is translated in that meaning. In the 15th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, the word *ιερουρυουντα*, is used. How is it translated in the Vulgate? by the word *Sanctificans*. By translating the word into “ministering,” I have the infallible authority of the Church of Rome in support of my rendering, and, therefore, Mr. Brown ought to have brought no charge of mistranslation against me. Moreover, when I take up the *English translation* of the Vulgate Bible, I read thus, in the 15th and 16th verses,—

“That I should be the minster of Christ Jesus among the Gentiles, **SANCTIFYING** the Gospel of God.”

Now here is the very word that Mr. Brown says ought to be translated “doing sacrifice;” rendered in the translation of his own church “*Sanctifying*.” If I have erred, I have gone astray in company to which Mr. B. cannot object.



Mr. Brown has told us, that, if I had read the Apostolical Constitutions entirely through, I would have found another passage therein, about "unbloody sacrifices."—Now, truly, if I had read about "an unbloody sacrifice," it would never have entered into my mind to interpret it as the "bloody sacrifice" of the Lord Jesus. I could not imagine that the words "bloody," and "unbloody," signified the same idea. Mr. Brown then read the passage, wherein it is said—

"Thou hast appointed an unbloody sacrifice through Christ."

It would be rather an odd thing for a man to offer up sacrifices of self through himself. If the "unbloody sacrifice" means Christ, then he must have offered himself through himself—"Thou hast appointed an unbloody sacrifice through Christ."

Mr. Brown has adverted to the verse in Malachi, on which some remarks were made yesterday, and he quoted the Hebrew words in the passage, which are translated "incense," and "oblation." I beg Mr. Brown's attention to the Hebrew words and their translation.

"From the rising of the sun, even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation : for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts." Mal. i. 11.

Now it has been said by some, that there is great uncertainty with regard to the translation of the Hebrew language from certain things called *vowel points*, they being of late invention only, and that without these we could not possibly know how a word ought to be pronounced ; but I beg leave to differ from this opinion respecting the uncertainty of Hebrew, for when we examine the Jewish rolls which are kept in the ark of the synagogues, we find none of them with vowel points ; but, nevertheless, the Jews can read them accurately. We know that all Hebrew SCHOLARS can read indifferently with or without points ; and Parkhurst, to whom reference has been made on the opposite side, rejects the vowel points altogether—he esteems them as Rabbinical things that ought to be cast aside by all Christians. We now come to examine this term which is translated in our Bible, by the word "*incense* ;" in the Roman Catholic version by the word "*sacrifice*." The Hebrew word which is here translated "*sacrifice*," in

other parts of the Douay Bible is translated “incense.” Because the sacrifice of the Mass was not to be tortured out of it in those other parts, therefore the word is correctly rendered “*incense* ;” but when it is wanted, as here, to wrest the doctrine out of the verse, *then* it is translated “*sacrifice*.” I will give a few passages from the Douay Bible to shew where it is thus translated “incense.” In the 4th Book of Kings, the 18th chapter, and the 4th verse, we read thus:—

“He destroyed the high places, and broke the statues in pieces, and cut down the groves, and broke the brazen serpent which Moses had made: for till that time the children of Israel burnt INCENSE to it: and he called his name Nohestan.”

In this verse the word is translated “incense,” and is the same Hebrew word, which, in the 1st of Malachi, is translated “sacrifice.” Again, in the 30th of Exodus, and the 7th verse, the word is rendered “incense.”

“And Aaron shall burn sweet-smelling *incense* upon it in the morning.”

Again, in the 3rd Book of Kings, the 3rd chapter, and the 3rd verse, it is translated “incense.” In the 9th chapter of the same book, verse the 25th, it is also translated “incense.” Here are four or five passages where the Hebrew word is rendered properly; but when we come to Malachi, the translation is changed, and the word “*sacrifice*” is used.

We now come to the word מנחה (*Mincha*) of which we have heard so much. I am not aware of any passage where it strictly means “*a sin-offering* ;” but “the bread-offering” and “meat-offering” which were constantly used together with “the sin-offering.” I will give an example from the old law. In the 2nd chapter of the book of Leviticus, in the 11th verse, it is written,

“Every oblation that is offered to the Lord, shall be made without leaven, neither shall any leaven or honey be burnt in sacrifice to the Lord.”

In the first verse you will see what the sacrifice was—it was one of “fine flour,” and called “a meat-offering.” A meat-offering was not a sacrifice for sin—the sacrifice for sin must have been *an animal whose blood could be shed*. In the 30th of Exodus there is another example of this. In the 9th and 10th verses it is said—

“You shall not offer upon it incense of another composition, nor oblation, and victim, neither shall you offer libations. And Aaron shall pray upon the horns thereof once a year, with the blood of that which was offered for sin, and shall make atonement upon it in your generations.”

Here is a distinction drawn between the "oblation" and "the victim," the one being an offering made up of flour—the other *an animal, whose blood was to be shed*. But Mr. Brown has told us, that in the verse in Malachi, the term could not but mean *the sacrifice of the Mass*. Now the sacrifice of the Mass is said to be "a true, proper, and *propitiatory* sacrifice;" and therefore *to be so*, there must be *the shedding of blood*; but in the meat-offering there could be no shedding of blood, because it was merely a cake made with flour. Thus it appears, from various passages, that the word מנחה (*Mincha*) means the "meat-offering;" and I could shew by as many more, that it was used for *a common gift*, bestowed by one man upon another, and is not applied exclusively to the meat-offering, and *not in any verse, to the victim* offered up as a burnt-offering.

But Mr. Brown has informed us that the Sacrifice of the Mass is not a continuation of the sacrifice of the cross, but a continuation of the Lord's Supper. Now this assertion is in direct opposition to the Council of Trent, which declares, in the 22nd Session, chap. 2nd, that the victim offered in the Mass is *one and the same as that which was offered on the Cross*.

The Council then asserts, that the Sacrifice of the Mass is a continuation of the sacrifice of the cross, that there is "one and the same victim." But we have been told, that it is not a continuation of the sacrifice of the cross, but that it is a continuation of the last supper.

A long parallel was drawn between the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb, and the supposed sacrifice of the Mass; and again, we were referred to the words of the institution. On these words I will only make one more remark. Mr. Brown said, that we can have no objection to his quoting from the Protestant Bible. I have not the slightest, but the Council of Trent has the greatest objection to it; and tells him in the 4th Session, *that he must not presume to use any translation but the Vulgate in public disputations*. Though we do not object to his using the Protestant Bible—the Council of Trent most assuredly does. Now how do we read in the Vulgate the words of the institution? They are translated in the *future* tense—"effundetur;" and in the Douay translation "My blood *that shall be shed*." There was no shedding of blood at the Institution—that was yet to be done. Upon the Canon of the Mass, moreover, a splendid eulogium has been passed by the Council of Trent, which tells us that every word is

pure, that it is—free from all error; and it to be observed that the Latin word, which is used in this Canon, is in the *future* tense—“*effundetur*”—“*SHALL* be shed.”

As some remarks have been already made on the 10th chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, it is not necessary again to go over the same ground. I will, therefore, only advert to a quotation that has been made of the 20th and 21st verses of that chapter:—

“But the things which the heathens sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God. And I would not that you should be made partakers with devils. You cannot drink the chalice of the Lord, and the chalice of devils:—you cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils.”

It is concluded from these verses, that to be “a partaker of the Lord’s table,” means to be “a partaker of the body, blood, soul, and divinity of the Lord Jesus.” According to the same interpretation, I may be allowed to argue, “that the heathen must have partaken of the body and blood of the devil,” for the same form of words is used—“Ye cannot drink of the chalice of the Lord, and the chalice of devils.” “The chalice of the Lord,” it is argued, means the “blood of Christ:” and, according to the same rule, I may say, that “the chalice of devils,” means “the blood of devils.” It is also said—“You cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord, and the table of devils:”—if “the table of the Lord,” means “the body of the Saviour,” then I may argue, by the same rule of interpretation, and say, “the table of devils” must mean “the body of the devil,” so that *this interpretation proves rather too much*.

I now proceed to consider some particulars respecting the Sacrifice of the Mass; and call your attention *to the difference* between the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper and that Sacrifice. You have been told that the one is a continuation of the other; but when we come to compare them, we will find some particulars in which they do not agree. Now, the *first* thing that strikes us, is this—that Christ spake in a *language* which the people *understood*, but the Canon of the Mass, being written in *Latin* is quite *unintelligible* to the mass of the people. Here is the *first difference*. 2ndly. At the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, *the cup* passed round *to all*—“they *all drank of it* ;” but when the Sacrament is administered in the Church of Rome, *only the officiating Priest* partakes of the cup. Here is the *second difference*, and, therefore, proves, that the one cannot be a continuation of the other.

3rdly. In the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, there was no shedding of blood ; but the Sacrifice of the Mass is said to be " a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice ;" therefore, there must be, to constitute it such, the effusion of blood. 4thly. Christ said, " Do this for a commemoration *of me*." The Canon of the Mass is somewhat different :—there it is said—

" Communicating and venerating, *in the first place*, (in primis) the memory of the glorious and ever-Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, and of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Here is a serious difference. In the one it is to be taken " for a commemoration" *of the SAVIOUR* ; in the other, to honour the memory *of a creature*—the VIRGIN MARY. 5thly. Christ said, when he was giving the cup to those who were around the table :—

" This is my blood of the New Testament which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins,"

but after the priest has secretly pronounced certain words, whispering them over the cup, he then says,—

" This is the chalice of my blood, OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT : THE MYSTERY OF THE FAITH."

We do not read these words in any of the gospels, yet are they inserted in the canon of the mass. 6thly. There is also this difference—in the Lord's Supper, we read only of wine ; there may have been water mixed with it ; but we *read only of wine*—it remains for the gentlemen opposite to *prove* that there was water ; but in the chalice on the altar, there is mixed wine *and water* ; and the Council of Trent pronounces an anathema against any who say that they ought not to be mixed. Thus you see, by comparing these together, that there are most serious differences discovered between them.

There is a book which has already given some annoyance ; it is called the Breviary ; and, perhaps, what I am about to quote from it may be amongst some of the " legendary lore" contained in it. For the 3rd of May is a service for the " finding of the Holy Cross." In this we read that when—

" Adrian was emperor, Alexander, governing the church, converted a great part of the Roman nobility to Christ. He appointed that only bread and wine should be used in the mystery ; but *ordained the wine to be mixed with water, on account of the blood and water which flowed from the side of Jesus Christ ; and added it in the canon of the Mass.*"

Here is the first intimation of the wine and water being mixed ; and it occurs in the time of the Emperor Adrian.

Thus, by the acknowledgment of this Breviary, it appears that the mixture was first made a considerable length of time after Christ's crucifixion, and did not take place before; for it is said that it was done "on account of the water and blood which flowed from the side of Christ," when pierced with the spear.

I cannot think that the *authors* of the Canon of the Mass believed that there was a substantial conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of the Saviour, when I read these words:—

"On which vouchsafe to look with a propitious and serene countenance: and deign to receive them as thou hast received the gifts of thy righteous child Abel, and the Sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham."

Here the sacrifice is equalized with the offerings of Abel and of the patriarch Abraham. The former offered a lamb, and the latter a ram, that was caught in the thicket—they both offered in sacrifice *only creatures*; and reasoning according to the canon, it must follow, that in the sacrifice of the mass there are *only* "*the creatures of bread and wine.*" Further on, in the same canon there occurs much to militate against a belief in the minds of the persons who composed it, that the body and blood of the Lord were substantially present. In another place it is thus said.

"May it please thee—that the Sacrifice which I, unworthy creature, have offered to the eyes of thy Majesty, MAY BE ACCEPTED BY THEE."

Is it to be believed that we creatures are to pray that the Lord of Heaven and of Earth would accept his own Son? Hath he not declared it over and over again, in the everlasting gospel, that, "This is my beloved Son *in whom I am well pleased?*" Hath he not declared by the very *fact* of the resurrection, that *he hath accepted* the sacrifice of our Lord and Saviour; and shall we dare to offer up our prayer that God may receive the sacrifice, when he hath put to his own broad seal and stamp that he *hath* received the righteousness and atonement of the Son of his love? And yet, here in the canon of the mass, is a prayer that the Lord may accept those things offered on the altar. There was a latent feeling in the minds of these men—there was a misgiving within them that the substantial body and blood of the crucified Saviour were not in the mass, or they never could have asked God to receive him at their hands, knowing that his sacrifice had been *already received*.

There is also another reason that induces me to reject this doctrine of the Mass—it *leads to idolatry*. There is no

use in softening terms, it is better to use plain language, so that there can be no misunderstanding. In speaking yesterday respecting *the defects* that may take place in the *form, matter, and intention* of the priest, you heard me remark, that even according to the admission of the Church of Rome herself, there was great danger of idolatry. It will not excuse any to say at the last day *that they were ignorant of the act* that they were committing. If such an excuse were to be admitted, *the heathen* might apologize on the same ground, and say, "we thought that God was in the wood and stone, and, therefore, we bowed to them:" this excuse cannot be taken, for *it would sanction every species of idolatry*. We are told that "the whole substance of the bread is changed into the body, and the whole substance of the wine into the blood;" but then it is said the species still remain, (that is, the colour, the external appearance, the form, the taste, &c.,) as they were before consecration. We say, that *it is rather extraordinary that the substance should change without any alteration in external appearances*. We know that when the water was converted into wine at the marriage-feast, that it changed colour and taste—its species were changed as well as its substance. But we are told that, in the wafer, all these outward things still remain; and, therefore, even taking for granted that the *substance* was converted, yet, the species still remaining, there are *creatures* still before us, and, therefore, if we bow down to them and worship them, we mix the things of the creature and the Creator. Here, then, we see a direct act of idolatry is committed, even if the assertion of the substantial presence of the Lord could be proved. For, *if the presence of God in any part of creation be sufficient sanction for worshipping that place or substance, then should we bow down to all parts of creation, for God is everywhere present*:—

"If I ascend into heaven thou art there: if I descend into hell, thou art present. If I take my wings early in the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea: even there also shall thy hand lead me: and thy right-hand shall hold me." "The Lord's ways are in a tempest and a whirlwind and clouds are the dust of his feet." "He ascended upon the cherubim, and he flew upon the wings of the winds."

Wheresoever we are, there is the presence of God around us on every hand—

"For, in him we live, and move, and have our being."

If, therefore, the presence of God in any place would sanction us in bowing down to it, then ought we, as I have said, to worship *every part of creation*—the heavens above



—the earth beneath—and the water under the earth. Therefore, the mere fact of the presence of God in a place, or substance, is *not* sufficient authority for us, that we should bow down and worship the thing in which he is said to be.

There is another serious evil to which this doctrine leads; *it robs the children of God*, if there be any in that church, *of the cup*. There is given to them the emblem of *death*; they are robbed of the symbol of *life*. They may talk of *concomitance*—of the blood and the body being together in the wafer; but, we say, it is utterly impossible; it is a thing that never can be proved. If we merely present the body to be partaken of, we only give the emblem of death; we are laying them under the condition of death, whilst, by withholding the cup, which is the emblem of life,—for in the blood is the life of the animal—we rob them of their title to life; therefore, we reject the Sacrifice of the Mass, on this ground also, because it plunders the laity of the cup of blessing and of life.

The Sacrifice of the Mass *opposes the finished work of the Lord Jesus*. It declares that his work is not finished; for *continuance proves inefficiency*, as you will see in the 10th chap. of Hebrews. On this subject I cannot enlarge—time will not permit.

It also opposes *the efficiency of the work of the Holy Spirit*; for if the reception of the substantial body and blood be sufficient to give eternal life, then there is no necessity for the agency of the Holy Ghost, “taking of the things of Christ,” and applying them to our souls.

I must now hasten to a close, even before my allotted time has expired, as I am rather hurried, in consequence of the distance that I have to travel; but, previous to my leaving, I should wish to make a few remarks apart from the immediate discussion of the subject before us. And, in the first place, to *the Rev. Gentlemen* opposite. If I have *unnecessarily* offended them by what I have said, I apologize for it; I am rough in style, and unpolished in diction, and unformed to rivet or chain down the minds or imaginations of men; but I have not yet learned the art of smoothing down what I believe to be the truth, to make it more palatable to any man; if, then, I have *unnecessarily* offended the Gentlemen, I am sorry for having hurt their feelings; but, still, one portion of the truth that I have uttered, I cannot retract.

I would wish to be reminded, as, no doubt, they also

would, of the ministry that I have received. We have heard that time is fast rolling onwards to a close, and that soon "we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ," to render up an account of our ministry, when we shall have to answer, not for our own souls alone, but for those precious souls entrusted to our charge; and, woe will be unto us, if we be found not to have preached the gospel to the people; woe will be to us, if we dispense not the words of eternal life to them; woe will be to us, if we warn not the wicked man from the evil of his ways, if, peradventure, it may please God to have mercy upon him, and turn his heart to the Lord. These are truths that we should always desire to bear in mind, knowing that we watch over souls as "those who must give account."

To the *young men of this place* I desire to speak the word of exhortation. You are now receiving lessons of much human wisdom, it may be, in this place, and your minds may be filled with these things—but recollect that there is a higher wisdom than this world can give you—there is "the wisdom that cometh down from above," that wisdom which man never can impart to you.—There is a wisdom which God only can teach you by his holy Word and Spirit. If you are only seeking the wisdom of this world, you are like a tree planted on the bank of some mighty stream—its waters cause the leaves to bud, and become green, and the boughs to expand and spread on every side; but at that very hour that the waters are causing the tree to rear its head on high, and stretch its boughs abroad, they are also, imperceptibly it may be, undermining its root, and preparing its ruin. So it is with you; if you be only growing in human wisdom, it will infallibly undermine all your happiness, and cast you into eternity without a foundation whereon to rest. But if you be planted by the side of that river which flows out of the City of God; if the Holy Ghost be working in your hearts by the word, and teaching you "the things which belong to your everlasting peace," then you have a foundation that cannot be moved—then will you be going from strength to strength, and from glory to glory, till you appear before God in Zion.

And to you, *my hearers in general*, I speak a few words. We met here last week, and one who sat amongst us is now numbered with the dead. She enjoyed health as many of you do this day. She was rejoicing in the circumstances attendant on this discussion, in its being a means of

bringing out the truth of God before the people. You may be rejoicing in this also, but let me ask, have you an experimental acquaintance with that word? I do not ask you hath it entered your understanding, but hath it been grafted into your hearts? Have you become acquainted with God, that you may be at peace with him? Have you appropriated to yourselves those “exceeding great and precious promises” which are made to you in the word of God? For even you likewise may soon, like her, be carried away to the eternal world, and then will your destinies be fixed, then will you enter on an unchangeable state—“as the tree falleth even so shall it lie.” O there is a serious—an awful—consideration in having the truth of God laid before our mind—we must be either the better or the worse for it—it must be either “the savour of death unto death” to the soul, or “the savour of life unto life”—

THE CHAIRMAN.

My dear friend—it is with great pain that I rise to call you to order. What you have been stating finds a ready response in my own breast, but I have a duty to perform, and if this digression, excellent though it be in itself, is permitted by me, I am of necessity bound to permit other digressions also. I beseech you to pardon me if I have transgressed, and to be assured that it is with great regret that I interrupt you.

Rev. J. LYONS.—I will not resume the discussion. I thank the Chairman and the gentlemen opposite, and all present, for hearing me during the time I have addressed them.

THE CHAIRMAN—I hope you rightly understood me.

THE REV T. J. BROWN.

As on several other occasions, my friends, I have to begin by correcting a few misrepresentations. It has just been said by the last speaker, that the Council of Trent forbids our using any other translation of the Bible than the Vulgate, against which prohibition he pretends that I have offended. I beg, therefore, to lay before you the passage to which the Gentleman referred:—

‘Statuit et declarat S. Synodus, ut hæc ipsa vetus et vulgata editio, quæ longo tot sæculorum usu in ipsa Ecclesia probata est, in publicis lectionibus,

disputationibus, prædicationibus, et expositionibus, pro *authenticâ* habeatur; et ut nemo *illam rejicere* quovis prætextu adeat vel præsumat."

"The holy Synod determines and declares that this ancient Vulgate edition must be considered as *authentic* in public lectures, disputations, sermons, and expositions; and that no one shall dare or presume to *reject it* upon any pretext whatever."

What a wide difference between *the rejection* of the Catholic version, and *the reading of a quotation* from the Protestant translation!

I am also misrepresented, as having said that the Sacrifice of the Altar is not *the same* as the Sacrifice of the Cross. I cannot charge myself with having said so—

THE REV. E. TOTTENHAM.—No; what Mr. Lyons said was, that *you* had declared the Mass to be a *continuation* of the Sacrifice which you suppose to have been instituted *at the last Supper*. From this declaration (inasmuch as we do not consider the *latter* to be *the same* as the Sacrifice of *the Cross*,) we conclude that the Sacrifice of the *Mass* is *not the same* as that of *the Cross*.

THE REV. T. J. BROWN.—It is not the same *as to the manner* only of the Sacrifice; for in the *one* instance it was a *bloody*, and in the other an unbloody Sacrifice; in the Sacrifice of the Cross, Christ was present after a *visible* manner and *suffered*; in the Sacrifice of the Altar, Christ is not present after a visible manner, and does not suffer. Such is the Catholic doctrine which I hold, and which I maintained from the beginning. Such is the doctrine which I read to you from approved Catholic works, and I know not how any person can be so captious, as to pretend to mistake my meaning.

Before proceeding to produce certain other arguments from Scripture in support of my position, I must briefly correct a little misapprehension which may have been created in your minds. Mr. T. has said that anathema has been pronounced by the Council of Trent against those who deny that the Sacrifice of the Mass is Propitiatory, and who assert that it is merely commemorative. If thereby was meant to be insinuated that according to the Catholic doctrine the Mass is not a commemorative sacrifice, I reject it as another of those unholy endeavours to create prejudice against the Catholic belief. The Sacrifice of the Altar we hold to be a *commemorative* sacrifice; but, as it does not exclude the real, though sacramental, presence of the victim offered, at the same time that it is Commemorative, it is *also Propitiatory*. This was fully declared in the "Exposition of Catholic Prin-

ciples," with which I opened my observations, the first time that I addressed you on this subject.

Mr. T. contends that there are wanting, in the Mass, two essentials to a Propitiatory Sacrifice; that there is not any destruction of the victim, and that there is no sacrificing priest;—"there is no Sacrificing Priest," he said, "but the Lord Jesus Christ." I ask Mr. Tottenham, did he not, yesterday, maintain that the prayers and praises of a contrite heart, and the bodies of believers were sacrifices? If he did, I find not therein any destruction of a victim.—I ask him, moreover, if it were not *possible* for the Lord Jesus Christ to have instituted such a sacrifice as that of the Catholic Altar? If it were possible for him to have instituted it, where would be the destruction of the victim? There could not be a *real and sensible destruction of himself*; there must be, consequently, only a *mystical destruction*. In the supposition, therefore, (and who will dare to deny its possibility?) that Christ had instituted the Sacrifice of our Altar, such a *Mystical Destruction* as would be found in the event of that institution, is *that which* exists in *our* Sacrifice. For we hold that, upon the Priest's pronouncing the words of Consecration over the bread, the Body of Christ, is truly present upon our altars,—that upon his pronouncing the words of Consecration over the wine, the Blood of Christ is truly present, *by the change* of the substance of bread and wine, as the primitive Fathers, from whose writings I read to you extracts, expressly declare; and that this presence of Christ's body and blood is after a *spiritualised, glorified, and sacramental manner*. Now, the *virtually distinct and separate* production, first of the blood and next of the body of Jesus Christ, by the force of the words of consecration, (although by accident and on account of *natural concomitance*, Christ is wholly and really present under each species) constitutes that *mystical destruction* of the victim, which preserves to the Mass the character of a true sacrifice. Moreover, the external species, containing substantially Jesus Christ, are received by the priest, and hereby is completed the *mystical* destruction of the victim. I know well that this explanation is not intelligible to many of you; nay, it might be that not in three, nor yet in six days would a doctrine, involving so much *Mystery*, be made intelligible to untutored understandings. You must recollect, however, that we are discussing what we hold to be a *Mystery*, and that, to pretend

to analyse a mystery, or to account for a mystery, or to fathom the depths of a mystery, is what no man, but he whose judgment is weak, will dare to presume to do.

Mr. T. objected that, in the New Law, there is no sacrificing priest. His argument was founded upon this, that, in the New Testament, the term ἱερεὺς expressive of a *sacrificing* priest, is not applied to ministers of the New Law.—But, if that term be not so applied in the New Testament, it does not convey to my mind the persuasion that we have not a true Sacrificing Priest; for it appears to me (in the exercise of my right to interpret Scripture), that *there are motives of prudence* which would have caused the use of that term to be withheld by the inspired writers. At the time when the Evangelists, and the other authors of the New Testament, wrote, the temple of Jerusalem continued to exist, wherein were offered *bloody* victims, and the priests who sacrificed those *bloody* offerings were termed ἱερεῖς. Now, in order to prevent any one from confounding the *sacrifices of the Old Law* with the *sacrifice of the New*, and the character and duties of the *Sacrificing Priests of the Old Law*, with the character and duty of the *sacrificing Priests of the New*,—the term which expressed a *Sacrificing Priest in the Old Law*, would not be applied to those of the *New Testament*. But so soon as the bloody sacrifices ceased in Jerusalem, the name was restored; and hence, in the earliest Liturgies of the Christian Church, we find the term in question applied to the Priests of the Christian Dispensation.

Mr. T. called your attention to certain *negative* arguments. You have heard, however, so much of positive evidence on both sides, that I think myself justified in not spending my time on arguments that are negative merely. I proceed, therefore, to consider the difficulties raised from the Epistle to the Hebrews. I wish to observe, in the first place, that the object of the Apostle was to shew to the Jews whom he addressed, that they were not to depend for salvation on the works of the law, but upon grace through the merits of Christ. His arguments, throughout, are directed to the *Jews*; *according to whose notions*, sacrifices should be *often* offered, and in a *bloody* and *visible* manner. It was to persons labouring under these misconceptions that the Apostle wrote; consequently, his language and reasoning would, naturally, be entirely directed against the particular prejudices of the people, whom he sought to confute. In this, then,



I discover the key for disclosing the true meaning of the Apostle. His words were addressed, as I have said, to those who knew of no victim of sacrifice but *a visible* one; at least their prejudices taught them to consider as a true sacrifice that only which was *visible and bloody*; and by opening the sense of the Epistle to the Hebrews by this key, I am furnished with an exposition of the objected texts of the Apostle, that is quite in conformity with the Catholic doctrine. I claim no merit to myself for any discovery. The learned Fathers of antiquity, men quite as holy, men quite as profoundly versed in Scripture language, men quite as fully endowed with the Spirit of God, as any members of the Reformation Society, interpreted the language of St. Paul as I interpret it. They understood it as I do; they used the same key to which I have directed you; and I borrow my exposition of the meaning of the Apostle, from the exposition of those who derived the true meaning of Scripture from the Apostles. Whatever modern teachers may presume to say on Divine matters, to me it appears unquestionable that, if there arise a doubt concerning the meaning of Revelation, we are to seek its solution from those who received their interpretation of Scripture more directly from the Apostles,—the early Christian Doctors, and the writers of the primitive Liturgies.

Opening the 17th Homily of St. Chrysostom upon the Epistle to the Hebrews, I find that the exposition which I am about to give of the Apostle's meaning, coincides with that which he gave; and there are many other great authorities by which it can be confirmed. St. Chrysostom, in the Homily to which I have referred, teaches that we offer daily on our altars a *true* sacrifice, far more efficacious than the sacrifices of the Old Law, *being the same with the Sacrifice of the Cross*; and that we have a *true* priesthood, Jesus Christ being our High Priest, and our victim. Thus is reconciled the prediction of Malachi with the language of the Apostle. Mr. T. objected to us, Heb. ix. 10—12.

“Christ entered *once* into the holy place having obtained redemption for us,” &c.

Our solution of this passage—“that Christ's *Sacrifice on the Cross* is not repeated, but *continued on our altars*,” the Rev. Gentleman pretended was an *artful* one. I know, at least, that it has been received by those holy and learned men, in olden times, who were well able to



judge whether there was any artifice in such an explanation. I find, moreover, this interpretation borne out by the testimonies from Scripture that I have before adduced,—the prediction of Malachi, and other passages which cannot be easily and satisfactorily reconciled with St. Paul, but by admitting this answer,—that our Sacrifice is *a continuation* of the one Sacrifice of the Cross, and is *not a new and distinct* Sacrifice from it.

Mr. T. argued from the 22d verse of the 9th chapter, wherein it is said—“without shedding of blood there is no remission of sin,” that the propitiatory nature of the Catholic Sacrifice is overturned. Mr. T. has read the context, and in all probability he must have seen, or if he will read it again, he will see that it *refers exclusively to the sacrifices of the Jews*; that it is not a declaration of the *only means* by which a sacrifice can be propitiatory. St. Paul is speaking, I repeat, of the sacrifices of the *Jews*; and *amongst the Jews* the propitiatory sacrifice was to be a *bloody* sacrifice: but he does not seek to define what is *essentially necessary* to every propitiatory Sacrifice, especially in the New Law.

You have heard Mr. T. quote the 9th chapter, verses 24—26, whence he formed this syllogism. If Christ is to be *often offered*, he must *often suffer*; but Christ does not suffer often; therefore Christ is not often offered in the Sacrifice of the Mass. But, suppose *we* exercise our right of private judgment; suppose we interpret the language of the Apostle, of a *visible and carnal* offering; that we conclude, from the alleged text, merely that Christ cannot indeed be *visibly and carnally* often offered, without often suffering; and that we maintain this to be the true meaning of the Apostle: the premises are thus cut from under Mr. T., upon which he rested his conclusion, that the *unbloody* Sacrifice of the Mass cannot be truly a propitiatory Sacrifice. Suppose, I say, that *we*, by the exercise of our private judgment, put this interpretation on the text of the Apostle, in which we are borne out by the authority of antiquity; it removes at once a difficulty which it is impossible, otherwise, to reconcile with other declarations of Scripture.

Mr. T. quoted verses 27, 28, wherein there is a parallel between man dying *once*, and Christ being offered up *once*; whence he concludes that, as man can *die but once*, so Christ can be but *once offered*. That Christ can be but *once offered*, that is, after a *bloody* manner, is *our* doctrine,

as I have again and again repeated. Christ's sacrifice on the cross cannot be renewed *after that manner* in which he sacrificed himself thereon: nay, *all* the merits of the sacrifice of our altar are referable to that sacrifice. But the question is, whether, because Christ cannot be offered a second time in a *bloody* manner, therefore Christ's offering on the cross cannot be *continued and applied* to us *by an unbloody oblation*. This is all we contend for, and this is the explanation we give of the doctrine of the apostle, reconciling thereby the conflicting passages which Mr. T. produced on *the one* side, and which I adduced on *the other*, from Malachi, from the words of Christ at his Last Supper, from the Epistle to the Corinthians, and from the figure of the Paschal Lamb.—What will you, my friends, say to this contrariety of interpretation? Most of you, I apprehend, already feel persuaded, that the arguments on either side are such that *you* cannot venture to decide between them; and this persuasion, if followed up, must either conduct you to the necessity of admitting the authority of some guide besides each one's private judgment, or it will mislead you to scepticism and infidelity.

Mr. Tottenham charged us with usurping the priesthood of Christ. It is a charge that is, indeed, entirely unfounded. We do not pretend to *succeed* Christ in the functions of *his Ministry*. We maintain that he has no successor therein: that he is for ever; whereby he is distinguished from the priests of old, who succeeded to each other in the priesthood by carnal generation, having *equal* powers and privileges. Christ is a priest *for ever*, after the order of Melchizedec. Christ is supreme in the power and excellence of his Ministry. He *is ever* interceding for us. But the Catholic doctrine is, that whilst Christ is *supreme* in the Sacerdotal Office, he has established upon earth *visible delegates*, not equal to him, but *his Ministers*, who were appointed when he ordered the Apostles to go and preach the Gospel to all nations. We hold, then, *not* that we are *equal* to Christ, but only that we are his visible Ministers and Delegates; not claiming as due to *ourselves* the honour or merit thereof, nor any higher distinction than that of being *the Representatives* of the One High Priest, from whom we receive certain powers and privileges, some of which my Rev. opponent also claims for the Priesthood to which he belongs.

Mr. Tottenham maintained, and Mr. Lyons had done the

same, that Catholics cannot be certain whether the Sacrifice of the Mass has been really offered, because they are not certain whether the matter thereof was valid. I apprehend that a somewhat similar difficulty must encompass the Gentlemen opposite. Mr. T. no doubt holds, in conformity with his Church, that baptism cannot be administered by any but *natural* water. If, therefore, doubt about the validity of the matter may exist on our side, there is some room for doubt on his side also. But we had a great deal said about the security of *moral certainty*, during the Discussion of last week. Mr. T. contended that moral certainty was sufficient to satisfy reasonable men. Now we can have this moral certainty with regard to the validity of the matter of our sacrifice; for we have the testimony of our senses assuring us that the bread and wine is proper bread and proper wine; we have also a moral certainty, resulting from the known good character of those who present this matter of the oblation upon the altar. This moral certainty is ordinarily sufficient for man.

Mr. Tottenham contended that there would be always a doubt as to the *Intention* of the Priest. I cannot assert with confidence what are the Rev. Gentleman's opinions with regard to the necessity or otherwise of Intention; but, perhaps, he will explain to us whether he considers that Baptism, given by a Minister of the Established Church who (being in truth an infidel) should say within himself,—"I mean not to confer any Sacrament; I intend to wash the *outside merely*; I am going to mock the institution of Christ;"—whether he considers that such a baptism would be valid or not? I am not quite sure, as yet, what answer he will give me; but he will determine, by his solution of this difficulty, the answer I shall make to his objection. However, we are but Men; in few instances can we arrive at greater than moral certainty; and moral certainty we may generally have with regard to the intention of the Priest.

The Rev. Gentlemen on the other side apprehend that the want of due Intention on the Priest may betray us into idolatry; that there is danger of our falling down to adore *mere bread and wine*, instead of adoring Jesus Christ, whom we presume to be present.—Do not suffer yourselves to be deceived by this, or by the many other evil insinuations which have been made against us. Idolatry is only committed when we pay to a created thing *that worship which*

*is due to God alone.* Supposing that, by accident, no consecration should be made of the bread and wine, and that there is *external* homage paid *before that* which, by mistake, is not the Body and Blood of Christ, yet, in such case, there is no Idolatry; for there is none such, when the Mind is not paying to a *Creature* the *Worship* which we owe to no other than God. Our adoration is designed for the Son of God alone, whom we presume to be sacramentally but substantially contained *under the appearance* of bread and wine; so that if, by accident, on account of any defect in the consecration, He were not to be *sacramentally* upon our altars, yet to Him only we refer our Adoration; and *we never pay any adoration to the mere external symbols, nor to the Elements of Bread and Wine.* However, the doctrine of Adoration, and the difficulties that are urged against it, belong to *Protestants of the Established Church* as well as to Catholics, although not, perhaps, to *all* the members of that Church at the present day; for I must observe that many variations have been introduced, since the establishment of Protestantism in this country, into its worship and belief: and these variations will continue to take place, so long as Protestants reject Authority, which alone can *confine men* to the true meaning of Holy Writ. But I speak of Protestants, high in veneration amongst you who have admitted the same Adoration of the Eucharist that we admit; and whose doctrine is open to the same difficulties as are brought against us. I will read to you a passage from Bishop Forbes, in his “*Treatise on the Eucharist*,” b. 2. c. ii. section 9th:—

“The sounder (and more sensible) Protestants make no hesitation *to adore Christ in the Eucharist.* For, in receiving the Eucharist, Christ is to be adored with true *Latria.*”

Again, section 8th,—

“’Tis a monstrous error of the rigid Protestants, who maintain that Christ is not to be adored in the Eucharist, except by an inward adoration of mind, but not with any outward act of adoration, such as kneeling, or other such posture of the body. All these do not believe aright of the presence of Christ in the Sacrament, he being there in a wonderful, but real manner.”

Thorndyke, in his “*Epilogue*,” b. 3. chap. xxx. p. 350, writes thus:—

“I suppose the body and blood of Christ may be adored, wheresoever they are; and must be adored by a good Christian, where the custom of the Church which a Christian is obliged to communicate with requires it. And is not the presence thereof in the Sacrament of the Eucharist a just occasion to express on the spot, by that bodily act of adoration, the inward honour, which we always bear towards our Lord Jesus Christ, as God?”

Again, in page 351 :—

“ Not to baulk that pardon, which hath led me to publish these my sentiments, I do believe that it was so practised (adoration was paid) and done before receiving the symbols in the ancient Church ; which I maintain to have been from the beginning of the true Church of Christ, obliging all to conform to it, in all things, within the power of it.”

This language was held by the Defenders of the Established Church, men to whose talents I am sure my Rev. opponent is ready to do homage.—I shall soon refer you to many of the Fathers supporting this doctrine, that adoration ought to be paid to Christ in the Sacrifice of our Altars. Their belief, therefore, was exposed to the same objections as are urged against ours ; yet these early followers of Christ found not any danger of Idolatry in the Adoration of the Eucharist, to deter them from that belief which we have received from the Scriptures, and which is confirmed by their testimony.—I observed above, that the Protestant Established Church was not always the same in its doctrines and principles as it is now. Mr. Tottenham knows that it has gone through many changes, and that in the first Liturgy, published by Edward VI., and in that of Elizabeth, it was allowed to pay a solemn act of adoration, when receiving the Eucharist, which is prohibited in your modern rituals.

Having sufficiently, I trust, gone through Mr. Tottenham's objections, and as there is not much time remaining, I deem it necessary to hasten on with my proofs in support of the Mass. In Acts chap. xiii. ver. 1, 2, we read :—

“ Now there was in the Church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers : as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the Tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said,” &c.

The term, which is rendered in the Protestant version “ *ministered*,” in the Greek is *Λειτουργούντων*. Now this term, I contend, expresses a real sacrifice ; “ as they *ministered*” being equivalent to “ as they *sacrificed*.” In proof of this position, first, we have the authority of a man who was not, in many respects, unfavourable to the Protestant doctrine, the celebrated Erasmus, who actually translates this passage, “ when they were offering sacrifice,”—“ *Sacrificantibus illis*.” Secondly, Mr. T. must allow that the term must mean here, as it does every where else, at least *public service* of some kind. Now I request he will inform us what that public service was, in which those Disciples were employed ? He must not tell me that it was the administering of sacraments, or preach-

ing ; for, if he looks to the text, he will find that they ministered to *the Lord* ; whereas the administering of a sacrament, or preaching, is addressed *to the people*?—He must not tell me that it was the ministry of *public Prayer* ; for, if he will read the third verse, he will find prayer distinguished from “ the ministering to the Lord,” and subsequent to it. It remains, therefore, that “ they ministered to the Lord ” *by sacrifice*, or the offering up of a victim ; whereof we find far more clear and distinct proofs in the next and following ages of the Christian dispensation, in which, however, there would not have been a trace of sacrifice, if they had not received such doctrine from the Apostles themselves. Thirdly, I may confirm, by other strong considerations, my interpretation of this text. We find the earliest rituals used by Christians called by the name of *Liturgies*. The Greeks call them *Λειτουργιαὶ*, a term similar to that which is employed in the Greek Scripture for the word “ ministering,” from which I derived my present proof. Now the true meaning of this word *Λειτουργιαὶ* will be explained, by opening those Liturgies, and seeing what is the sort of public ministry which they prescribe. We find, therefore, those Liturgies (bearing, as they do, a name that corresponds with the term which, in the text just now quoted, you translate “ ministering,”) explicitly exhibiting to us, not only belief in the *real presence*, not only a *change of substance*, and belief in *Transubstantiation*, but also, and principally, belief in the propitiatory Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ offered on Christian Altars. Yes! such sacrifice is as clearly expressed in the earliest *Liturgies* as it is in our modern *Catholic Rituals*. From the sense, therefore, of the term *Λειτουργιαὶ*, I am justified in my conclusion, that the word in the text adduced *Λειτουργούντων*, is of similar import, meaning *the ministering of Sacrifice*.

I entreat your reflection upon another argument in confirmation of this interpretation. The Greek language, to this day, is not altogether a dead language ; it has been altered in some respects, but still it is a living and spoken language. To the Greeks of this day, therefore, it is not without reason that we may appeal, for the true meaning of the Greek term in the text adduced. Now, I would gladly leave the present Controversy to the decision of any Greek Priest, whether the term which the Greeks still use to express “ the Sacrifice of the Mass ” is not the very



term used in the text of the apostle, from which I have just argued. From all this, then, I contend that there is *in the Acts of the Apostles, a term which explicitly signifies the Sacrifice of our Catholic Priesthood.*

The Protestant authorities, which yesterday I adduced, recommend us to have recourse, on disputed questions, to those who first received from the Apostles the true meaning of the doctrines of Revelation. Indeed, it is inconceivable how the Church, to which Christ promised his Spirit, and with which he declared that he would abide to the consummation of the world, could have fallen into gross Error, Error involving Idolatry, in the first, second, and third ages after the resurrection of Christ. If, then, we appeal to the rituals, which are records of the faith of those primitive Christians, we find most clear and undeniable testimony that they admitted the Sacrifice of our Altars.

I know not at what period Mr. T. will contend that the "*Idolatry of the Mass*" crept into the Christian Church. I maintain that, *at no period*, can he show that Idolatry found its way into the Universal Church, thereby falsifying the promise of Christ, that he would be with his Church to the end of time. However, Protestants do assign *different* periods when "*the Idolatry of the Mass,*" they say, crept in; but there are few, if any, who fix it before the termination of the *fifth* century. Now I have here a palpable fact, which will demonstrate that, *prior to the fifth century, the present Catholic doctrine was held on Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass, on the Sacraments, and on most other dogmas of faith:* there are, indeed, but very few of our doctrines which are exceptions to the conclusiveness of this argument. Early in the fifth century, several persons, called Nestorians and Eutychians, fell off from the Catholic faith. These sects have existed, and do exist, to the present day. Now it has been clearly demonstrated, that the Nestorians and Eutychians did maintain, before their separation, the same belief *as we do still*, concerning the Sacrifice of the Altar and Transubstantiation; for into other points it is not necessary on this occasion to enter. We have the Liturgies of the Nestorians and Eutychians; and these Liturgies, as you will hear just now, express, as clearly as words can express, the belief *we maintain* in those important doctrines.



Here is another general argument, which is also a palpable one; an argument, which, I trust, will reach the understanding of every one of my present hearers. There was a time, Mr. T. will not deny this, when the Catholic doctrine was universally held. My Rev. opponent may select the period when Berenger impugned the Sacrament of the Altar, or any other, when I care not, if there be but some period assigned upon which I can rest my reasoning; even if it be as near to our time as that in which Luther endeavoured to invalidate the Catholic doctrines. Recollect, moreover, that those doctrines were not speculative, but *practical doctrines*. They were the practical doctrines of those Christians who lived at that period which Mr. T. may choose to assign; as often as they repaired to their Churches, they worshipped Christ present in the Sacrament, and the Sacrifice of our Altars. Now, they *must have known what* they worshipped, and *what* they professed to receive when they participated in the Eucharist. Reflect, also, that the generations of men do not commence and terminate together, but are mixed up one with another, so that the young men of the *present*, are acquainted with the old men of the *preceding* generation. From this I reason; first, that no one generation can be ignorant of what the preceding generation had practically believed; and, that thus we may ascend from generation to generation, till we reach the times of the Apostles. Now, whatever period be assigned, (and some period must be assigned,) when *all* believed the Catholic doctrine in the Sacrament and Sacrifice of the Altar, this *universality* of belief being once admitted, it is impossible that the Protestant doctrine could ever, *prior to that belief*, have prevailed;—that ever, antecedently, therefore, it could have been held by the Church that the body of Christ was *not* substantially *present* in the Sacrament, and *not* substantially *offered* in the Sacrifice of our Altars. For, had *any preceding generations* universally entertained the Protestant doctrine, how could they have *all* come round to embrace the Catholic doctrine? Suppose, as must then have been the case, that there had been a schism amongst them upon this matter, we might have found *some* taking up the Catholic doctrine; but *all* would not have embraced it:—or if, at the supposed period, a *doubt*, however strong, had arisen in favour thereof, we might, perhaps, find such doctrines

afterwards held, but *by some only*, as a matter of *opinion*, and not *by all*, as an *article of belief*.

Again, I maintain that our doctrines, on such practical questions as those we are discussing, could never have been introduced, in any age subsequent to the age of the Apostles, because, at whatever subsequent period this had happened, we should find demonstrative proofs, in Ecclesiastical history, of the *novelty* of these doctrines. Protests would have been entered;—Councils would have been assembled;—Heretics would have charged the Catholic Church with her falling off from the Unity of Faith, and with introducing change and novelty into her doctrines: but there never was a period in which such Councils were held, such Protests entered, or such charges brought. Hence I contend, that they never were a novelty: and my argument is borne out by the circumstances attendant upon all the innovations in faith recorded in Ecclesiastical history; for there never was a heresy, whether of Arius, or Macedonius, or Berenger, or Luther, or any other, that was not publicly followed by Dissensions, —by Protests, —by Writings, —by Councils—by proofs palpable in Ecclesiastical records, and marking *the precise time* when such novelties found their way into the Church. Now, nothing of this kind can be shown in regard to the present Catholic doctrine: therefore, the present Catholic doctrine *could not have been at any time the doctrine of the universal Church, without having been her doctrine from her commencement*.

Moreover, had innovations in the ancient Faith been made, at any period, by the Church of Rome, *the Heretics of that time would have exposed them*; for there were heretics in all ages, who watched the Roman Catholic Church, and were anxious to criminate her conduct. If, then, the Roman Catholic Church had professed the doctrines of Transubstantiation, and of the Mass, without their having been handed down from the first ages, the Simonians, the Cerinthians, and all those heretics that existed from the first ages, or the Arians, the Macedonians, or the heretics of subsequent times, till we come to the Greek Church in the 8th century, would have recorded their opposition; they would have contended that the Roman Catholic Church had fallen under the same censures which she inflicted upon them. But, as *they never did object to the novelty of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, or the*

Sacrifice of the Mass, those doctrines *never could have been novelties*, but must have existed from the time of the Apostles themselves.

These arguments which I have adduced, are strongly corroborated by the actual belief of the Greek Church. The Greek Church holds the same doctrines on the questions under controversy as the Catholic Church holds; yet the Greek Church was ever so jealous of the Western Church, that it never would have allowed or admitted its articles of faith, unless they had been founded upon the belief of the early Fathers, who received their doctrines from the founders of Christianity. Protestants, at the commencement of the Reformation, felt the force of this argument, and attempted to deprive the Catholics of it. Accordingly, Melancthon transmitted his translation of the Confession of Augsburg, in 1559, to Jeremy the Patriarch of Constantinople, hoping to engage him to approve the novelties of Protestantism; and in union with the Protestants, to condemn the Catholic Church. This was accompanied by an artful letter, wherein Melancthon tells the Greek Patriarch that Protestants admit the doctrine of the *Fathers* of the Greek Church; also its general Councils, although Melancthon knew that the second council of Nice was expressly rejected by his reforming brethren. Moreover, in the Confession of Augsburg, the presence of Christ in the Sacrament is proposed in terms to which an unsuspecting Catholic might subscribe. How, then, was it received by the Patriarch Jeremy? He found it did *not go far enough*: it did not contain *Transubstantiation*, although it artfully expressed the real presence: therefore, in the name of the Greek Church he rejected the confession of Protestant Faith thus presented. However, the Protestant party found, at last, a Patriarch of Constantinople, Cyril Lucar, who having simoniacally intruded himself into his high office in the year 1621, was willing to subscribe to their tenets. But how was his conduct viewed by the Greek Church? He was solemnly deposed by a Synod of Greek Bishops, for having approved of the doctrines of Protestants! This, therefore, confirms my reasoning, that, as the Greek Church never held a different doctrine, on Transubstantiation and the Mass, from the Catholic Church, consequently, the Catholic doctrines never were a novelty; for, in that case, the Greek Church would, on no account have adopted them. Thus, my positions are borne out

by arguments founded on Scripture, on the Primitive Fathers, and on the evidence of Ecclesiastical history; all of which conspire to demonstrate the truth of the Catholic doctrine.

---

THE REV. E. TOTTENHAM.

MR. CHAIRMAN,—At the opening of this discussion on the second question, Mr. Brown seemed to be exceedingly confident as to the body of evidence he could adduce *from Scripture* in defence of the substantial presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and also of the Sacrifice of the Mass; and really I was then led to suppose that he would have made the effort almost entirely to prove these points from *that* source. But now my Rev. opponent seems to have some misgivings as to the effect which his *Scripture* proofs have produced, or are likely to produce, for during a considerable portion of both yesterday and to-day, he has gone almost completely into the great maze of the Fathers and of Ecclesiastical history.

He commenced his *first* speech of this day by complaining of the existence either of *bad faith*, or of *ignorance*, on the part of the advocates of Protestantism, which had been exhibited in what he considers the partial quotations from the “Apostolical Constitutions,” and from the Fathers. With respect to the alleged partial citations from the “Apostolical Constitutions,” (which was the charge brought against Mr. Lyons), my friend has answered for himself: and in reference to the text in Malachi, (with which the charge against myself was connected), I confess I am not disposed to comment much on my opponent’s *attempt* to set aside my quotations from Tertullian, Jerome, and Theodoret, or to prove them garbled. I am perfectly satisfied that his observations have not had weight with the reflecting part of the assembly, but have rather tended to establish what I advanced.

In *each* case it has been admitted that the exposition I gave from those Fathers with respect to *one* term, at least, of this prophecy, has been correct, although our opponents had argued from *both* terms. It is true I have been charged with stopping short in the middle of the quotation from Jerome, which, according to Mr. B.'s version, concludes with saying that there should be "a clean oblation in every place, *such as is offered in the Christian ceremonies.*" But what, after all, does my opponent's addition prove? it does not *necessarily* imply the *Sacrifice of the Mass*? Mr. Brown must therefore produce more *positive* proof, before he detects me in an exhibition of bad faith in the quotations I have made.

Mr. Brown asserts that I sought to bring the Fathers into disrepute. This, certainly, was not my object. I said that some of them at least were holy men, as there are holy men at the present day, and that we receive their testimony simply *as witnesses* to certain facts, but do not like to take them as *positive authorities*. I do not undervalue them, *when legitimately employed*; but I say that if Mr. Brown could produce to me this day any number of quotations he pleased from their writings, and I could produce a single clear text of Scripture on the other side, I would fling the authority of the Fathers to the wind, and stand by *the word of God*.

The Rev. Gentleman asserts, moreover, that I made an "artful attempt" to impose upon those present, when I quoted from a variety of Roman Catholic doctors, who declared that there was no clear proof of Transubstantiation in Scripture, and therefore held that doctrine simply on the authority of the Church. Now Mr. B. complains of my having made this statement in an artful way, because, as he says, the passages cited do not prove it to have been their opinion that the *bodily presence* of Christ could not be proved from Scripture, but only *the manner* of that presence, whether by Transubstantiation or otherwise. Such is the distinction drawn by Mr. Brown; but, at all events, he must recollect that, *even though* this distinction were admissible in the *other* cases, it does not apply to the passage I quoted from *Cardinal Cajetan*. That passage spoke thus:—

"There does not appear out of the Gospel any thing to compel us to

UNDERSTAND THESE WORDS LITERALLY, namely, ' *This is my body* ;' and truly THAT PRESENCE, which the Church holds, cannot be proved by these words of Christ, unaided by the declaration of the Church."

THIS is the language of Cajetan, and I think it can be reconciled neither with the *distinction* Mr. B. has drawn, nor with Mr. Edgeworth's statements concerning the *clearness* and *perspicuity* with which this matter is revealed in the sacred volume.

Reference has again been made to certain passages from the Fathers; and my Rev. opponent has dwelt on a quotation from Cyril of Jerusalem, in which he believes him to institute a comparison between the change of water into wine at the marriage in Cana of Galilee, and the change of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Hence it is concluded, that as the one was a physical change, so must the other be. As this, Sir, is the last day of the discussion, and as I have several things of more consequence to notice, I cannot now afford the time which it would take me to examine this quotation *fully*. But, that I may not seem entirely to disregard the passage, I shall place *in juxtaposition with it* another quotation from Cyril, and let Mr. Brown give a consistent interpretation of it, according to the principle on which he would explain the passage which *he* has adduced.

" Ye are anointed, says Cyril, with ointment, and ye have become partakers of Christ. For, as the bread of the Eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is no longer mere bread, but the body of Christ; so this consecrated ointment is no longer mere or common ointment, but the free gift of Christ and the presence of the very Godhead of the Holy Ghost energetically produced. Hence ye are symbolically anointed upon the forehead, and upon the other organs of sense. For with visible ointment the body is anointed; but by the holy and vivifying Spirit the soul is sanctified."—*Cyril Catech. Mystag.* iii. p. 235.

Now, if Mr. Brown's mode of understanding the passage *he* has quoted from Cyril be correct, namely, as implying Cyril's belief in the substantial change of the bread and wine in the Eucharist, *then*, from that just cited *by me*, I may conclude that Cyril held *a physical change in the ancient chrism or ointment* after consecration, because *he compares* the change of the *bread* in the Eucharist to *that* change. But, in fact, never was any change believed to

take place in the chrism but a *moral* change : therefore, when Cyril compares the change in the bread to the change in the chrism, he must have held it to be moral, and not physical.

But my Rev. opponent has adverted to my allegation of his having misquoted another passage from the same Cyril, respecting what constituted the grand secret of ancient Christian mysteries. The part in question was certainly omitted at first, and therefore the stating this to be the case, was no "presumption" on my part. He has also enlarged considerably upon what he reckons a "most grievous charge," which, in my last speech, I brought against his friend Mr. Edgeworth, of *suppressing an important part in the dialogue of Theodoret*. He says that his friend had no particular purpose to serve by such an omission. Of course I cannot enter into Mr. E.'s secret intentions, but you will judge of *the importance of the omitted part*, when I shall read it to you again. After the part which Mr. E. quoted, Orthodoxus (the imaginary representative of the true faith in Theodoret's dialogues), rejoins thus:

"You are caught in the net which you yourself have woven. For the mystical symbols, *after consecration*, PASS NOT OUT OF THEIR OWN NATURE: inasmuch as they still remain IN THEIR ORIGINAL SUBSTANCE (*ὁυσιας*), and form, and appearance; and they may be seen and touched, *just as they were before consecration*."—See pp. 388—390.

This portion, Mr. B. says, *can easily be shown to be non-essential!* So far from thinking that, I contend that, since it is here declared that the elements, *after consecration*, continued, not merely in their original form and appearance, but IN THEIR ORIGINAL SUBSTANCE, Theodoret could not have held anything like the doctrine of the *bodily presence* of Christ in the Eucharist, as it is held at the present day by the Church of Rome. But Mr. Brown endeavours to get out of this difficulty, by telling us the passage *may be translated otherwise*. It may be rendered, he says,—"*In the shape and form of the former substance*." Certainly *such* a rendering would sound very like Transubstantiation, if it could be positively proved to be *correct*; but I am bold to say, that the veriest tyro in Greek, if the passage were presented to him, would not give Mr. Brown's translation, but that which I have given



you. I have the Greek passage before me, and I shall be satisfied to leave the translation of it to any Greek scholars that may be mutually selected.

Mr. BROWN. Shall we appoint a scholar?

Mr. TOTTENHAM. Yes, afterwards. Mr. Brown, moreover, accuses me of not going far enough, but I accuse him of *not going farther still*. What does Theodoret further say?

“ Therefore compare the *image* with the *archetype*; and you will perceive their resemblance: for the *type* must needs be similar to the *truth*.”

So that, you perceive, *after* the observation to which Mr. Brown referred, he uses the terms “*image*” and “*type*.” While using *such* expressions, in addition to the *previous ones* which I have noticed, it is difficult to conceive how he could have propounded the doctrine of a *physical* change.

We come now again to “THE LAW and THE TESTIMONY;” and I trust it will appear that, whatever Mr. Brown may have advanced, he has not set aside the positive testimony given over and over again yesterday from that source against the Sacrifice of the Mass. In replying to his observations, I need not enter fully into *all* points, as my friend Mr. Lyons *has anticipated some matters* on which I should *otherwise* dwell. Mr. Brown has referred to the words of the Institution, as containing a proof that such a Sacrifice as the Mass was instituted at the last supper: and as, when quoting from Matthew and from Luke, and from the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, he may have conveyed an impression to the meeting, that he was giving *threefold* Scripture proof of his point, I would observe, in passing, that in these three quotations, he was giving but *one* proof, the *same* circumstance being *recorded in three different places*. But let us come to the proof. He says the text declares Christ’s blood was shed *at that moment*, and consequently there must have been a sacrifice *then* instituted, which he believes to be the Sacrifice of the Mass. But—

1st. I ask Mr. Brown, if he were acquainted with the mode of Scripture language, would he have ventured to hazard such an argument as *this*? I fancied it was known to every one, that the *present* tense is continually

used in Scripture *when the future is intended*. Let me give an instance or two of this. You recollect that when our Lord and his disciples were together along with Judas before his passion, he said to Judas, "That which thou *doest*, do quickly." (John xiii. 27.) What was his meaning? Evidently, "What *thou art about to do*, do quickly." A considerable time previous to this we find our Lord saying, "*I lay down* my life for my sheep." (John x. 15.) Did he lay it down *at that moment*? No; he spoke with reference *to the future*; his meaning was, "*I will lay down*, or *I purpose to lay down*, my life for my sheep." Again—in the 2nd Epistle to the Thessalonians, speaking of the coming of the "Wicked One," St. Paul says, "Whose coming is according to the working of Satan, in all power, and signs, and lying wonders." (2 Thess. ii. 9.) Now the "Wicked One" *had not yet appeared*; the Apostle therefore evidently wrote with reference *to the future*, though he used the present tense. My Rev. opponent's argument from the use of the present tense in the case before us, is, therefore, one of very *trifling* moment, when you look at the parallel cases I have given you, by which it is shown that the *present* is frequently *used*, though the *future* is *intended*. Moreover—

2ndly, it is not to be forgotten (as Mr. Lyons has already told you) that, 1st, the standard Latin version of the Church of Rome, the Vulgate, reads the passage in the *future* tense (*effundetur*)!—2nd, the Canon of the Mass reads it in the *future* tense (*effundetur*)!—and 3rd, the Roman Catholic English Bible, which I have before me, reads "that *shall be shed*"! Now, even were Mr. B.'s argument from the use of the present tense valid (which I have just endeavoured to show you *is not the case*), yet I think that, before our friends could argue from it with a good grace, they had better go and *correct* the Vulgate, and the Canon of the Mass, and their own English translation too.

My opponent contends, as I have said, that the Sacrifice, of which the Mass is a continuation, *was instituted at the last Supper*. I have argued against the position, that such an institution *took place*; but now I shall go farther, and I maintain that, even if it were proved that Christ instituted a Sacrifice at the last Supper, such a fact, so far

from establishing, would entirely overthrow the professed *propitiatory* nature of the Sacrifice of the Mass. For every Sacrifice *previous* to that on the Cross was *typical*, not strictly *propitiatory*; if then Christ instituted a Sacrifice at his last Supper, (that is, *before* that on the Cross,) it must have been typical, *not propitiatory*. How then can it be inferred that the Sacrifice of the Mass, which Mr. Brown tells us was *instituted at that time*, is *propitiatory*?

Proceeding now, Sir, to notice Mr. Brown's *last* speech, the first thing I have to do, is, to reply to a charge of misrepresentation brought against my friend Mr. Lyons. We shall see whether the charge has been made good, or not. Mr. Brown referred to the decree of the Council of Trent relative to the Vulgate, and he complains sadly of what Mr. Lyons had said on this point. As he read the extract from the Council of Trent respecting this matter, I noted down these expressions,—that “the Vulgate was *to be held authentic*, in all lectures, disputations, sermons, and expositions;”—and, moreover, that no one was to “*dare or presume to reject it on any pretext whatever.*” These words Mr. Brown himself read; and let me ask, when he is quoting the Protestant translation of Scripture, or the Greek text, *whilst the Vulgate has quite a different tense*, is he not, in this instance at least, *rejecting the Vulgate*? Has he not, in *this* his “*disputation*,” because he thought it suited his purpose better, taken the former *in preference* to the latter? and what is that but rejecting the Vulgate?

Mr. Brown has at length adverted to my arguments on the Sacrifice of the Mass; and I am glad he has done so in some measure; for I have been a long time endeavouring to bring this about. The first argument I advanced against the proper and propitiatory nature of the Sacrifice of the Mass, *in my concluding speech of the fourth day*, was, that IT WAS DESTITUTE OF THE ESSENTIALS OF A PROPER AND PROPITIATORY SACRIFICE. The *two essentials* which I noticed were, first, *the destruction of the victim*: and, secondly, *the existence of a sacrificing priest* to offer it.

I. I argued, on that occasion, that *the destruction of the victim was essential* to a proper and propitiatory sacrifice—that Christ, who is said to be the victim in the Mass, *does not die* in the offering of that sacrifice, inasmuch as Scripture

saith, (Rom. vi. 9.) that, “being raised from the dead, *he dieth no more*”—that, consequently, there is *no destruction* of the victim *in the Mass*—and, therefore, that the Mass cannot be *propitiatory*. How then did Mr. Brown answer this argument? I really expected a better reply: he mentioned how I had alleged that *prayer* and *praise* were *sacrifices*, and yet he could not find any destruction of a victim *in them*! But the Reverend Gentleman ought to remember, that the question is about *literal, proper, and propitiatory* sacrifices, not about such as are *merely spiritual*. I do not talk of the destruction of a victim in a merely spiritual sacrifice, for such language would be absurd; what I contend for, is, that, with regard to a *proper* and *propitiatory* sacrifice, (such as the Mass is *said* to be), the destruction of the victim is *absolutely essential*; and this *I proved* from Scripture, at the time before mentioned. I think, then, I may safely say that my argument still holds good. I repeat the form of it:—The *destruction of a victim* is *necessary* to constitute a proper and propitiatory sacrifice; there is *no destruction of a victim* in the Sacrifice of the Mass; therefore, the Mass is *not a proper and propitiatory sacrifice*.

II. I spoke also of the existence of a *Sacrificing Priest* as being essentially involved in the notion of a propitiatory sacrifice. With regard to this, Mr. Brown confesses that the word *ιερευς*, or *sacrificing priest*, is *not applied to the ministers of the gospel in the New Testament*: and, then, by way of accounting for the fact, he tells us, that there were certain “*motives of prudence* to cause the withholding of this title!” Mr. Brown is very fond of *suggesting what would, or would not, be prudent ways of acting on the part of God*; but I prefer building, (and, I think, I have evinced this throughout the discussion) upon what God *has actually said or done*, and for this conduct I have been commended by Mr. Edgeworth. The Reverend Gentleman has, at all events, *confessed THE FACT*, that no such title as *sacrificing priest* is applied to ministers of the gospel in the New Testament. *THAT FACT, thus admitted*, and whether admitted or not, indisputably *proved*, (as I showed when before considering this subject) not only *by the negative silence*, but *by the positive assertion* of Scripture, is quite sufficient for me: and, I may affirm, therefore, that my argument upon

this point also, holds good. To repeat the form of it, as in the last case, I say—A *sacrificing priest is necessary*, in order that there may be offered a proper and propitiatory sacrifice—there is *no sacrificing priest* under this dispensation, except CHRIST HIMSELF—therefore, there can be *no* proper and propitiatory sacrifice, except *that* which CHRIST HIMSELF *once* offered. Thus, I still maintain my position, that the Mass is destitute of *these two essentials* of a proper and propitiatory sacrifice.

In *my first speech yesterday*, I followed up the foregoing, by the addition of a *negative argument*; but my adversary has disposed all at once of that, by declaring, that, as there is so much which is *positive*, to be attended to on both sides, he feels justified in not dwelling on what is merely negative. It is true, I do not rest so much upon the *negative argument* I then adduced against the Mass, as I do upon the *positive*; but still, I think, that *it has considerable force*. As Mr. Brown did not refer to it, and as there may be some present to-day, who were not here yesterday, I shall, without going into particulars, merely state *the outline* of the argument. It was this:—that *there is a total silence respecting the mass in those parts of Scripture where we might most reasonably expect to find it, if such a sacrifice were to exist* under the New Testament dispensation.

I took *three* of the most striking and prominent cases in which this silence is observable:—1. *The commission given to the Apostles*.—2. *The letters written by St. Paul to Timothy and Titus*, for the express and avowed purpose of teaching them how they should behave in the church—and, 3. *The account given of the assembling of the Primitive Christians for worship, and of their general proceedings*, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. In viewing these different cases, we observed *the striking fact*, that, although all the grand peculiarities of Christian worship and ministerial duty are there adverted to, viz. reading, prayer, preaching, sacraments—yet, there is *not the most distant allusion* to any thing like such a Sacrifice as *the Mass*. Therefore, I say, this negative argument *does* appear to me to have strength, and of this you will judge better when you read it (*as more fully developed in my first speech of yesterday*) in the printed Report.

Mr. Brown proceeded to comment on the Epistle to the

Hebrews; and, he thought, that, in certain observations with which he introduced the subject, he had found a *key* to the interpretation of the whole Epistle. According to the view which he gave, the object of the Apostle was to shew the Hebrews that they were not to depend upon the law, but on Christ. The Epistle, he said, was addressed throughout to Jews, and, therefore, the language would naturally be directed against the persuasion of that people. I admit this was somewhat of the Apostle's object; but, let not Mr. Brown imagine, that, because this may be so, his Church can escape *the application* of the Epistle. Let him, on the contrary, remember, that *we charge the Church of Rome with bringing us back to the days of the Jewish polity*; and, upon *this* ground, the arguments of the Apostle would be equally powerful against the Jews of old, and against the Church of Rome in this day.

In addition to the general remarks which Mr. B. made respecting the design of the Epistle to the Hebrews, he also has commented on *some* of the particular texts which I quoted from that Epistle, and it will be for you to judge how far he has met them. He says, that the passage (Heb. ix. 22,)—"Without shedding of blood there is no remission"—upon which I founded an argument, proves nothing in the present case, *because it referred exclusively to the sacrifices of the Jews*. But, I contend, there is a *principle* laid down in that passage (as appears particularly from the verses which immediately follow), namely—"that without shedding of blood there is no remission;" i. e. that the *blood-shedding* or *death* of the victim, is necessary in order to *propitiation*. This passage, then, applies most powerfully to what is called the *unbloody* Sacrifice of the Mass; and the argument I used in connection with it, was this:—"Without shedding of blood there is no remission;" so says the Apostle—"the Mass is an *unbloody* sacrifice;"—so says the Church of Rome:—therefore, say I, the Mass *cannot obtain remission*, and consequently is not a proper and *propitiatory* Sacrifice, which the creed of Pope Pius 4th affirms it to be.

My opponent has also referred to the 9th Heb. verses 24 to 26, on which I made *several* observations, *one* of which he has substantially stated. He has endeavoured to get over the difficulty here by the exercise of his *private* judgment upon the passage, to which, he justly conceives, he has quite as good a right as I have. Far be it from



me to blame Mr. Brown for this, but I would remind him that the mere exercise of private judgment is not an argument, but only the means by which to try the force of arguments. As this, therefore, is *the only way* in which he has attempted to answer my arguments from this passage, it is needless for me to repeat them. You that heard them in my first speech of yesterday will judge for yourselves, whether they are cogent, and you that have not, may read them in the printed Report.

But I quoted in the same speech the verses which immediately follow (the 27th and 28th.); and the observation I made was, that there was a parallel drawn in them between a man *dying once*, and Christ being *offered once*: I added, by way of application, that until Mr. Brown could prove that a man could *die more than once*, he could not (according to this passage) prove that Christ is to be *offered more than once*. Mr. Brown attempts to get out of this difficulty, by declaring the meaning to be, that he is not to be offered a second time “after a *visible and bloody* manner.” The language employed, however, is “As it is appointed unto men *once* to die, and after this the judgment, so also Christ was *offered once* ;” and you will perceive there is no such qualification or reservation here as Mr. Brown would propose.

The Rev. Gentleman complains that I charged him and his brethren with usurping the priesthood of Christ, and then he tells us they do not pretend to succeed to his priesthood, or to be equal with him, but only to be his delegates. I *never said* that they claimed *equality* with Christ, but I said they claimed to be *sacrificing Priests, and the charge of usurpation followed*, in my judgment, *necessarily on this*. I am glad of Mr. B.'s confession, that Christ is one and for ever in his Priestly office, for this confession makes my argument the more easily applicable. If Christ be *the only* Sacrificing Priest under the Christian dispensation, (as I contend he is, and *no proof* has been adduced on the other side *to the contrary*), then we think it follows that the Roman Catholic Priesthood, professing to exercise (as they do when they celebrate Mass), the office of *sacrificing* priests, *intrude into the office which is only his*: and, on the other hand, having *no real claim* to the office, the sacrifice which they offer continually, (that is, the Mass) cannot be “a true, *proper*, and *propitiatory* Sacrifice.”



With regard to the amount of certainty that belonged to the Sacraments in the Church of Rome, you will recollect that, yesterday, a variety of passages were adduced from the ROMAN MISSAL, pointing out the fact, that, even were we to admit the doctrine of Transubstantiation (speaking in a *general* way) yet, upon the *confession* of Roman Catholics themselves, *there were very many cases in which there might be no proper and valid consecration*, and, in which, therefore, *no physical change* would take place.—We were told, in that authorised book (the Missal), that there might be defects in the *bread* (if it were not of a peculiar kind, &c.)—there might be defects in the *wine*, (if it were a little sour, &c.)—there might be defects as regarded *the intention* of the officiating *priest*, &c.; and therefore, we argued that Roman Catholics are, (upon their own principles) *in a sea of uncertainty* as regards the *validity* of the *consecration* of the elements, and, consequently, the *efficacy* of the *Sacrifice* of the Mass itself. And how did Mr. Brown attempt to get out of this?

1st. He *adopts the very same course which he charged upon me as a fault* in the discussion on the Rule of Faith—that is, he endeavours *to involve me in a similar difficulty*. Now, whether his retort have force or not, it is enough for me, therefore, under present circumstances, to reply to Mr. Brown thus:—“This is not the line of argument you should adopt—*your* faith is now attacked, therefore, defend your own principles, and do not seek to point out any difficulties you may believe to exist in connection with *mine*: we are now discussing the Sacrifice of the Mass, and not any thing held in the Protestant Church.” But—

2ndly. Mr. Brown combats the objection by affirming that he can have a *moral certainty* as to the validity of the Sacraments; and then he tells me, *I argued a great deal in favour of moral certainty* in the discussion upon the Rule of Faith, and, therefore, ought to admit it here. I certainly did; and I think that the moral certainty we *then* alleged was *cogent*; but, so far from granting his conclusion, that I ought to admit it *here*, I should rather designate the moral certainty in the Church of Rome, respecting the validity of Sacraments, as *moral uncertainty*. Do but read over the extracts from the Roman Missal, about the defects that may occur, and you will see that the whole thing is enveloped in uncertainty. Mr. Brown adds—

3rdly, “ *We have the testimony of our senses, that it is proper bread and proper wine.*” There we come to the testimony of the senses again! I thought Mr. Brown threw them overboard long ago, and would not allow them in *my* case; and, yet, he brings them in again when an answer is required to objections that may be started against *him*. Therefore, if such an argument be deemed valid by Mr. Brown, in this case, all *my* arguments yesterday and the day before, derived from the senses, *are also valid*, according to the present argument, and the practical acknowledgment of the Rev. Gentleman himself.

My opponent made some observations on what had been said by Mr. Lyons and myself, *respecting the danger of idolatry arising from these contingencies* (which I have just noticed) *connected with the elements, and the intention of the officiating priest*. Upon this he breaks out into an appeal to you, not to listen to the unjust insinuations that had been made against Roman Catholic doctrines, and the misrepresentations that had been given of them; and, truly, I say, wherever a *false* representation, or an *unjust* insinuation, has been made, *listen not to it*, but wherever statements are *proved*, or conclusions *legitimately drawn*, then receive them. He says, it is not the *intention* of Roman Catholics to commit idolatry. Surely, *we never said it was*. But, he says, moreover, that, supposing the consecration should, by accident, *fail*, and no Transubstantiation take place, yet, if a Roman Catholic does not *intend* to commit idolatry, he does *not* commit it. Now, while I at once acknowledge that it is not *the intention* of a Roman Catholic to commit idolatry, I beg to differ from this *latter* statement. The position, if it were true, *would* (as Mr. Lyons said) *excuse all idolatry*, for there never was a heathen so base or degraded as *to intend* to commit idolatry; and will Mr. Brown say, that therefore a heathen never *did* commit it? If we turn to the history of the Israelites, we find this statement of mine corroborated. Look at the case of Aaron and the golden calf. The people worshipped the calf; but did they *intend* to commit *idolatry*; or to make their worship terminate *in the image itself*? They did not; for we read, that Aaron said—“To-morrow is a feast to the LORD, or JEHOVAH.” Yet, were they excused? Not at all; they were *guilty* of idolatry, just as if they had expressly intended it. (See Exod. chap. 32.)

In proceeding with his proofs of the Sacrifice of the Mass, Mr. Brown adverted to the 13th chap. of the Acts of the Apostles; and, I must say, I was more than surprised by a reference to that chapter. I thought that Roman Catholic disputants had almost given up this text, and, I fancy that, although Mr. Brown concludes he has discovered in it “a term explicitly signifying the Sacrifice of the Roman Catholic Priesthood,” he might as well have spared himself the trouble of entering into a disquisition on it. However, as it has been quoted, I must refer to it, and I shall, therefore, read the passage again :—

“Now there were in the Church which was at Antioch, prophets and doctors, among whom was Barnabas, and Simon, who is called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manahen, who was the foster-brother of Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. And as they were ministering to the Lord, (λειτρουργεῖν δὲ αὐτῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ) and fasting, the Holy Ghost said to them, Separate me Saul and Barnabas for the work whereunto I have taken them. Then they, fasting and praying, and imposing their hands upon them, sent them away.”—Acts xiii. 1—3.

In this text Mr. Brown discovers the Sacrifice of the Mass! He says, the expression, translated “*ministering*,” denotes *public service*, and must refer to a *real sacrifice*, because it was said to be directed “*to the Lord* ;” whereas the administration of Sacraments, and preaching, are directed *to the people*. But, may I ask, are not *prayer* and *praise* directed unto the Lord as well as a *literal sacrifice*? There is, therefore, no validity in *this* observation. Again.—He supposes the term cannot refer to *prayer*, because prayer is mentioned in the 3rd verse; and this mention, he thinks, distinguishes it from the “ministering to the Lord” in the 2nd verse. Now, I say, *that is the very reason* why I should assert that it *did* refer to *prayer*. Mark the expression in the 2nd verse—“As they were *ministering to the Lord* and *fasting*.” And, it is said in the 3rd verse—“Then they *fasting and praying*.” The word “*fasting*” is *repeated* in the 3rd verse, and thus we are fairly left to conclude, that “ministering to the Lord,” and “praying,” mean substantially the same thing.—Further, Mr. Brown contends, that it must mean a literal sacrifice (and, that sacrifice, he concludes to be the Mass) *from the force of the Greek word*, translated “ministering.” To this I reply, *first*, that the *Vulgate* (that Latin version of the Scriptures, which is certainly looked upon as high authority in the Church of Rome) does not translate the

Greek term by a word which means *literal sacrifice*, but by the word "*ministrantibus*," which means simply *ministering*. But, *secondly*, to point out the consequences of Mr. Brown's interpretation, and to show, that the word on which he rests, does not necessarily imply sacrifice at all, much less the Sacrifice of the Mass, I shall refer him to a few passages where it occurs. 1. Let us take the 13th of Romans and 6th verse. Speaking of governors and magistrates, the Apostle says:—

"For they are the ministers (λειτουργοὶ) of God, serving unto this purpose."

The original word translated "ministers" here, is radically *the same* as that translated "ministering" in this passage of the Acts. If Mr. Brown, therefore, rests upon the force of the Greek word, as necessarily referring to literal sacrifice, then, what can *I* prove upon the same principle? I can establish from its use in Rom. 13, the extraordinary doctrine, *That every magistrate is to offer literal sacrifice!* 2. I refer again to the 15th chapter and 27th verse:—

"For it hath pleased them; and they are their debtors. For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things; they (the Gentiles) ought also in carnal things to minister (λειτουργῆσαι) to them (the Jewish believers.)"

Here, again, is exactly the *same word* used. Therefore, if Mr. Brown argues correctly from the 13th of Acts, that it must mean a literal sacrifice, I can prove, upon the same principle, that the Gentiles spoken of in this passage, were to offer a literal sacrifice in carnal things to the Jewish believers!. But this, you perceive, is a gross absurdity. 3. I shall give only one more quotation out of the many that might be adduced to show that the word does not mean of necessity, or primarily, literal sacrifice. It is contained in the 1st chapter of Hebrews, 14th verse, where, speaking of *angels*, St. Paul says—

"Are they not all ministering (λειτουργικὰ) spirits, sent to minister for them who shall receive the inheritance of salvation?"

The *same word* is here also employed; and if its meaning be such as Mr. Brown would make it in the 13th of Acts, then the interpretation of this passage would be—"Are not the angels all ministering spirits;—or, *spirits that offer literal sacrifice*—for them who shall receive the inheritance of salvation?"

Thus have I carried out Mr. Brown's own scheme of interpreting this word, and we see *it by no means necessarily means sacrifice at all*, but that such an idea would oftentimes introduce palpable absurdities and falsehoods. If Mr. B. again contends, that the Sacrifice of the Mass is proved from the 13th of Acts, he must explain to me the passages of Scripture to which I have now referred, *according to the meaning he would affix to the word in question.*

Mr. Brown next entered, at considerable length, into an historical review of some circumstances connected with the subjects we are debating. It is impossible for me, at the present stage of my address, to follow him into *all*; but I must notice a remarkable fact stated by my opponent, for which I am much obliged to him—namely, that the Eutychian heretics and others, maintained precisely the same doctrine as the Roman Catholics do on this subject. Indeed, I am very ready to admit it; and, in connection with the admission, I maintain, distinctly, that Transubstantiation *is of heretical origin*—that it formed the *basis* of the heresy of Eutyches. If Mr. Brown can take advantage of *this*, he may. The Fathers, of whom we have heard, spoke, I admit, in strong terms of the Eucharist, and of a change taking place in the elements: I contend, however, that the passages speak of a *moral* change, *not a physical*—a change in *the use* of the elements, and not in their *nature*, which is the doctrine held by the Church of England in the present day. But, I do believe that the first introduction of this doctrine of Transubstantiation (though in a rude state and without a name), was at the time of the starting of the Eutychian heresy, for the argument of *the heretic* (as we heard yesterday) was this:—

“As the symbols then of the Lord's body and blood were different before the consecration of the Priest, and after that consecration are physically changed, and become something else; in the same manner, we (Eutychians) say, the body of Christ, after his ascension, was changed into the divine substance.”

It was in answer to this, that Orthodoxus made the reply, already quoted more than once. I may observe, too, that *the reply could have no force against Eutychianism, except upon the supposition that the modern Roman Catholic doctrine of Christ's bodily presence in the Eucharist, WAS DISBELIEVED BY THEODORET IN THE FIFTH CENTURY.*

But, said the Rev. Gentleman, *surely there would have*

*been protests and opposition against this doctrine, if it had been introduced at any time as a novelty. And so there were protests and opposition. I wonder that any man, who professed to be acquainted with Ecclesiastical history, should start such a point as this. When the Euty-chian heresy began, the doctrine of a physical change in the elements (on which it was based) was opposed by Theodoret, as we have seen; also by Pope Gelasius; and, afterwards, by Ephrem of Antioch. Does not Mr. Brown recollect, moreover, that, when Paschasius put forth the doctrine in the 9th century in a more regular form, and after that period also, there were many men, and able men too, who strongly opposed the doctrine? Among them were Bertram, John Scot, Erigena, Berenger, and others—not to forget Rabanus Maurus, who used the remarkable expression concerning it—“THIS ERROR HAVE WE OPPOSED WITH ALL OUR MIGHT.”*

I find my time has nearly expired for the present, and I have but one speech more to make. I beg, therefore, to observe, that, connected with this subject upon which we have been debating, is that to which Mr. Lyons referred before he left the room, as one of the baneful consequences that are made to flow from the doctrine of Transubstantiation, I mean, *the withholding the cup from the laity*. This is a most striking point, and particularly so, when not merely we can produce *the words of the institution*—not merely can we produce *other* texts of Scripture, which tell us that the *wine* was to be *given to all*, as well as the *bread*, and, likewise, that *all received the wine* as well as the bread—but when we can *likewise adduce the confession of the Church of Rome herself, that, in the early ages of the Church, the administration was in both kinds!* Yes, Sir, we have heard much of *antiquity* to-day, and yesterday; but *here* is a point in which antiquity is manifestly *against* the Church of Rome, *by her own confession*, for, *in the Council of Constance it is admitted that, in the early ages, they gave in both kinds*. Dr. Delahogue, also, in his Class-Book of Maynooth College, *says it was so till the 12th century*: and yet the Church, in her wisdom, has, in these latter times, chosen *to take the cup from the people*. Upon this point I shall just read the reasons assigned for keeping the cup from the laity, as I find them in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, a book of undoubted authority in the Church of Rome:—

“The Church was, no doubt, influenced by many and most cogent reasons, not only to approve, but also to confirm by the authority of a decree, the practice of communicating under one species :

1. The greatest caution was necessary, lest the blood of the Lord should be spilled on the ground, which could scarcely be avoided, if it were administered in a large assemblage.

2. Besides, when the Holy Eucharist ought to be always in readiness for the sick, it were very much to be feared, lest, if the species of wine should remain too long unconsumed, it might become rancid.

3. Besides, there are a great many who cannot bear the taste or smell of wine.”—*Cat. Concil. Trid. Pars 2. de Euch. Sac.*

These are three of the cogent reasons. I will now give you the fourth——

[The Chairman then observed, that the Rev. Gentleman's time had expired.]

### THE REV. F. EDGEWORTH.

MR. CHAIRMAN,—Let it be understood by the Meeting, that this is the last occasion, on which it can be addressed by the Advocates of the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Eucharist—the doctrine of Transubstantiation; meaning, that a total change of substance is effected, by the power of God, in the bread and wine which are taken to the altars of the Catholic Church;—and the equally important and disputed doctrine, that, in the Sacrifice of the Mass, as it is offered on the same altars, there is a true, and proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice, instituted by Jesus Christ.—As, then, this is the last occasion on which we have an opportunity of speaking on these doctrines, it will, at once, be understood, that I can follow the Rev. Gentleman opposite, in all his objections to them, but very briefly; in order that I may have an opportunity of laying before the meeting, which, at the present time, includes many persons, who have not before attended our discussion, an outline of the arguments taken from the Scripture, and from such other sources as may be deemed to possess authority; to establish our doctrine and practice.

With regard, therefore, to the various observations



which Mr. Tottenham has just addressed to the meeting, I shall neither pretend to notice them exactly in the order which he has selected, nor to touch upon any others than those which he seemed to consider the most important. He has just told you, that one of his heaviest charges against the Catholic Church is, that it withholds from the laity the cup. Certainly, this subject is nearly allied to the subject in debate; but, I must maintain that it is not exactly a part of the matter chosen for our present discussion; and I should waste the precious moments which remain, if I entered on this new topic at length. Accordingly, I shall content myself with referring the meeting to No. 4, of a series of pamphlets published by Mr. Brown, entitled, "*Catholic Truth Vindicated.*" In that pamphlet will be found a summary of the arguments which Catholics use, to show that, to receive the Eucharist under one form, is not contrary to any command received from Jesus Christ; and that such discipline does not deprive the laity of any portion of the rite instituted as essential by Jesus Christ. Not only will you find this charge, irregularly introduced by Mr. Tottenham, disproved by the arguments of Catholics, but you will, moreover, see it acknowledged by many Protestants, to be without any foundation. Let me observe by the way, that on this, and on every other disputed point of doctrine, our Protestant friends may, by having recourse to Catholic works, by consulting the Catholic clergy, by conversing with well-instructed Catholic lay persons, easily inform themselves what are our real doctrines, and upon what they are founded.

Mr. Tottenham observed, that he thought we were dissatisfied with the appeal we had made to the evidence which Scripture affords of the truth of our doctrines. He must allow us to speak with more authority than he can, of the degree of satisfaction which *we* feel on this, or any other subject. I tell him, that *we* are perfectly satisfied that the Holy Scriptures most clearly establish the Catholic doctrine, and the Catholic practice; and as clearly condemn that gentleman, and those who, denying the truth of the words of Jesus Christ, omit to receive that nourishment for their immortal souls, which our divine Saviour has provided, and the non-reception of which, he has told us, will be punished with the loss of eternal happiness.

"Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you."—John vi. 54.

We are perfectly satisfied with the testimony which the Holy Scripture affords; we have appealed to it as confidently as Mr. Tottenham has done; and if we have failed in convincing him of the correctness of our exposition of the written word of God, it may be, that we have not equally failed with the rest of the assembly. At any rate, Mr. Tottenham's right to appeal to the Holy Scriptures, and to expound them, according to the light which *he* fancies God has given him, is not greater than *my* right to do the same,—if he will adhere to his own principle.

Mr. Tottenham has remarked, that we have not noticed in detail, his quotations from Cardinals Cameracensis, Cajetan, and some other Catholic divines, who, according to his statement, have expressed an opinion, that the doctrine of Transubstantiation is not to be found in the Holy Scriptures. Now, this is not much to the purpose. Last week I observed, that he quoted some few divines on other topics, in a similar way; he contended, that Cardinal Bellarmine, and others, were not satisfied that particular texts of Scripture proved the doctrine of Purgatory. Now, it appears to me, that Mr. Tottenham is conscious of a wish and expectation, that such statements would lead the meeting to infer, that Cardinals Cameracensis and Cajetan, and other divines he mentioned, differed from the Catholic Church, on the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and on the doctrine of Purgatory. I defy him to sustain this unjust inference. His only advantage, if advantage it be, is, that they were not satisfied that *certain texts*, to which we appeal ordinarily in controversy with members of the Established Church, ought to be appealed to for the purpose for which we use them. But he well knows, and must allow, that the divines which he has enumerated, were a very small minority in the Catholic Church; that the far greater number of our divines, and of the Fathers, pre-eminent for learning and piety, have uniformly expounded the texts in question, as we have done throughout the present discussion.

Mr. Tottenham seems to cling with some affection, to the charge brought against me yesterday, of *purposely*, (for it was so insinuated, when he said, he had “caught me,”) of *purposely* curtailing a quotation from Theodoret. But, as Mr. Brown has drawn your attention to *his* act of curtailing, which, inasmuch as his attention to the passage, appears to have been more deliberate than mine, is less

easily explained, perhaps I ought to take no further notice of the matter. However, I must remark, that though he has, at last, read the words which he at first omitted, he has not laid that stress upon them which he *ought* to have done, and which he knows they deserve. The words that follow those which he said I had purposely left out, distinctly tell us, that the Christians, in the time of Theodoret, did, in effect, '*adore*' what we have upon our altars, after the words of consecration. Mr. Tottenham lays *no stress on that*! He is a master of emphasis; and when he avoids laying the stress which is due to those words, I think I am justified in saying, that he is endeavouring to make an escape from the meaning of Theodoret, and the force of his testimony.

Mr. Tottenham contends, that the present tense *sometimes* signifies the future; and, therefore, he begs leave to understand the passage which describes the institution of the Eucharist, in the future tense, contrary to the authorized Protestant version of Scripture, and thus comes over, for once, to the Catholic version. Whether you will grant him that permission, I know not; and, in truth, it matters little.

Mr. Tottenham proceeded to say, that even if Christ did establish a Sacrifice at the last Supper, *it must have been typical*. I here beg to remind him, and the meeting, of an expression which he has repeatedly used to my edification,—so as to lead me to hope that he will one day see, in all their clearness, the truth of those doctrines which he now opposes—namely, that he will never presume to prescribe to Christ, the Son of God, what *he ought* to do. Now, he has ventured to do this; for he says, if Christ instituted a sacrifice, *it must have been typical*. By this term, he means that it must have been *simply figurative*; which is equivalent, in my judgment, to saying that Christ could not institute a *real* sacrifice, or his argument is nothing to the purpose.

Now, then, we have Mr. Tottenham, who has exhibited a far greater share of wariness than Mr. Lyons, stating what Mr. Lyons, in his innocence, asserted before; namely, that Christ *could not* institute the holy Eucharist in the sense and meaning in which it is regarded by the Catholic Church. To this declaration I wish to fix Mr. Tottenham. If he means to say, that Christ *had not the power* to give his

body and blood to be eaten and drunk—as the Catholic Church believes and teaches that he has done—then, I think it no longer worth while to appeal to his knowledge of the Scripture, or to take further pains to convince him of his errors; for, if he adheres to this declaration—if, I say, he prescribes limits to the power of Jesus Christ, the ground which I thought, on a former occasion, was common to both parties in this discussion, he does not share with us. But, after all, I must think, that Mr. Tottenham believes the divine nature of Jesus Christ; and, consequently, that the power of Christ is infinite—*his* wisdom—*his* truth unquestionable. Reminded of this, and that his own mind is finite, Mr. Tottenham does not, I am quite sure, deliberately intend to say, that Christ *could not* do this; if he were, then, Christian Brethren, I would pass from Mr. Tottenham, and appeal to *your belief*, at least, in the words of Scripture. Mr. Tottenham tells us, however, that Christ *could not* give the Apostles, at the Last Supper, his *real* body and blood—that he *could not* give them a command to perpetuate that sacred rite. Go, then, to the words of the institution—there you will find him saying to the Apostles—“Take, eat;—*This is my body—This is my blood* which is shed,” or about to be shed—(take either version—I lay no stress on the difference—) “*for the remission of sins—drink ye all of it.*”

But our arguments throughout have, as the Rev. Gentleman knows, been addressed to those only who believe in the divine nature of Christ, who know his power to be unlimited, who feel therefore that it is not for them to set bounds thereto, and that Christ *can declare and do things* which our *understandings cannot grasp*. Hence the only question which ought to have arisen between us was, *has* Christ said this, or that? *Has* Christ ordained this, or that? No one should have argued, so as to imply that individuals might come to the discussion with this reserve; “I will believe Christ’s words *if they appear to be reasonable*. I will obey his ordinances *when I think there is no contradiction in them, to the testimony I receive from the senses, or other sources.*”

Mr. Tottenham is most incorrect when he imputes to us the assertion that there is no Priesthood in the new law.

MR. TOTTENHAM.—I said it, speaking of a *sacrificing* priesthood—not you.

MR. EDGEWORTH.—In commenting upon the words of Mr. Brown, my Rev. opponent appeared to me to say that Mr. Brown had acknowledged he had not succeeded Christ in the Priesthood.

MR. TOTTENHAM.—Yes.

MR. EDGEWORTH.—If he means to impress on your minds, that we allow there is no Priesthood in the Christian law, he imputes to us that which is not true.

MR. TOTTENHAM.—The *latter* observation which Mr. Edgeworth has repeated, was *my deduction from Mr. Brown's admission*.

MR. EDGEWORTH.—Then I will say that the deduction has been drawn from nothing that Mr. Brown said. We do maintain that there is a priesthood of the Christian law; and if we held otherwise, as Mr. Tottenham does, we should be opposing our puny wisdom, to that of a vast array of Christians, in every age and country, from the establishment of our holy religion, down to this moment. The Rev. Gentleman said the other day, with some caution, “*strictly speaking, there is now no priest;*” although *he himself* is honoured with that title, in the established Church. He has since become more cautious, and has frequently said, ‘*there is no sacrificing priest.*’ I am aware that the established Church does not put forward a claim for its priests to the title of Sacrificing Priests; but if the Established Church of this country which is so small a fragment of the Christian world, does not put forward such a claim, it is no reason why *we*, for the first time since the days of Christ and the Apostles, should cast aside the title which has ever distinguished the ministers of Christ.

MR. TOTTENHAM complains that his negative arguments have not been sufficiently adverted to by our side; he has required us to notice the passages of the Holy Scripture, where, according to his presumption, there should have been mention made of the power of the priesthood to offer up sacrifice, if any such power were instituted by Christ. But the Rev. Gentleman is too good a logician to think that I ought to employ much of my time in disposing of such remarks. I will, however, remind you of the impressive words in which Christ commissioned his Apostles to go forth, and preach to every nation the necessity of “*observing all things whatsoever he had commanded.*” Mr. Tottenham cannot pretend that Christ here enumerates *the*

*functions* of the sacred ministry. He had *previously* instructed the Apostles in the detail of those things which his followers were to observe; and he had assured them that although they might not understand at present, the Divine Spirit should be given to them, to bring to their minds *whatsoever* they had forgotten, or expound to them *whatsoever* they had misunderstood. We, accordingly, know that, although only these few words were used in the commission, "*Go—teach—Baptize,*" yet many other things were faithfully remembered, practised, and transmitted by the Apostles, after their Divine Master had withdrawn his visible presence from the earth.

Mr. Tottenham seems to have kept his mind perfectly closed against the arguments addressed by Mr. Brown, with respect to the ancient discipline of the Secret. To some now present, for the first time, this matter is, probably, perfectly novel. To many who attended earlier in the discussion, it is still obscure: but in a few words, I will remind the meeting generally, that in the early ages of the Church, the Apostles and their successors did not, for sacred reasons, promulgate at once and every where, all the mysteries of revelation. It was their duty to preach the Gospel to mankind; in the discharge of this duty, for reasons to be mentioned presently, they did not, at once, draw attention to some of the most sublime mysteries of their divine religion. They waited till their hearers were prepared by grace, and gradually led by instruction to become fit to receive, in all its fulness, the knowledge of Revelation, and the belief of those things which men were commanded to know and practise, in order to receive eternal life. Mr. Tottenham is aware, and I hope the meeting will bear it in mind, that there is undeniable evidence of that ancient discipline of keeping secret from the vicious and ignorant, and even the partially instructed, until a future and more favourable season, the knowledge of some of the most incomprehensible mysteries of Revelation. Our Saviour himself, at his Last Supper, (on which solemn occasion all the circumstances recorded by the Evangelists should be attended to,) when he instituted the holy Eucharist, the sacrifice of the New law,—the Mass,—had none present with him but his chosen twelve. Amongst his holy ordinances *this* was a most precious pearl, which they were not incautiously to cast to swine.



His prophetic declaration to the multitude, that he would give them '*his flesh to eat and his blood to drink*,' had been met by a burst of scornful incredulity, and even the abandonment of many of his disciples. John vi. 53, 67.

It is also proved by most authentic records of antiquity, that the successors of the Apostles, seeing the storm raised around them by Pagan prejudices and power, guarded, as far as they could, by the discipline of Secrecy, the Mysteries of the Christian religion from the profane jests, the cavils, and contempt, which unenlightened human reason would not hesitate to direct against them. Evidence of this has been adduced on our side, from the instructions of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, from the writings of St. Ambrose, from Theodoret, and others; it would be very easy, moreover, to adduce yet more abundant testimonies,—showing too clearly to be questioned by Mr. Tottenham, that the discipline of the Secret prevailed throughout the Christian world, for more than the first 400 years, and until the power of paganism was no longer arrayed against the spread of the Gospel. Now this same spirit of cautious anxiety, which undeniably was felt, during more than four centuries, to guard the most sacred and most important parts of Christian doctrine from the unholy gaze, and the profanations of the Heathens, may, I contend, be a good reason why the inspired writers have not said more than was just necessary to give evidence of the divine institution and nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, which, according to Malachi, was to be offered, from the rising of the Sun unto the going down of the same, till the end of the world. Mr. Tottenham cannot deny the existence of the ancient discipline of the Secret; let him then say when it begun?

Mr. Tottenham felt exceedingly uneasy, as it appeared to me, and unwilling to answer the question which Mr. Brown put in reply to one of his objections, namely,—is Mr. Tottenham certain—and on what grounds—that *he* has received baptism? In reply, he merely says that we are to defend our doctrines, and not to assail his.—The Reverend Gentleman contended, that we cannot be certain whether the bread and wine used for the Sacrifice of the Mass, are such as Christ ordained; and therefore, that whenever we adore the victim offered up on our altars, we never can be



perfectly assured that we are not committing an act of idolatry. Is Mr. Tottenham, with his undeniable talent, unable to distinguish between the real idolatry, of which we should be guilty if *Christ were not God*; and the mere mistake of which we should be guilty, were we to adore Christ, *the true God*, presuming him to be present where he was not. Mr. Tottenham knows well, and understands the distinction; I hope, therefore, that for the sake of truth, to us, who are oftentimes charged with the crime of idolatry, he will employ a portion of the time he has left in doing us justice.

Returning to the allegation of our uncertainty respecting the most solemn act of the Catholic religion, I maintain that it is unreasonable to urge it against us. If Mr. Tottenham's reasoning is worth anything, let him state what certainty he has of his baptism? Baptism is necessary for his eternal salvation: now my Reverend opponent knows not the intention of the priest who baptized him, with more certainty than the Catholic knows the intention of the priest who consecrates. *Natural water* is the necessary matter of Christian baptism; he is not more certain that natural water was used, than we are that the Catholic Priest takes proper bread and wine to the altar of God. He may say this has nothing to do with the charge of uncertainty which exposes us to the dangers of idolatry; but the meeting must see that the argument of uncertainty is completely retorted. If, then, Mr. Tottenham knows not how to sustain his confidence in his baptism, I will tell him. Baptism has been made necessary to salvation, by a God who loves us with an infinite love; consequently we may rely with confidence that his goodness will protect us effectually from the appalling dangers to our eternal welfare, which, if Mr. Tottenham's argument were sound, would menace us at every step, and on every side, and against which no human vigilance would be a sufficient guard.

I have asked Mr. Tottenham to tell us if he denies that the Sacrifice of the Mass, as it is celebrated in the Catholic Church, has come down to us from the time of Christ; I have asked him to tell us when our doctrine and practice in this matter first prevailed? He says, relatively to Transubstantiation, it appears to him that it began in the days of the Eutychians. Has he forgotten the testimonies

which I adduced yesterday from the Apostle St. Paul, from St. Ignatius, the bishop of Antioch, who, he must know, lived before the fifth age, the time of the Eutychians, and who, having been a disciple of Peter, and his successor in the government of the important see of Antioch for a long series of years, finished his mortal career by laying down his life for the faith of Christ? That *holy* father, (I am glad to have heard a member of the Reformation Society adopt an unusual phrase, and style him *holy*,)—that holy father distinctly says, as I read to you yesterday, that the Gnostics, in denying the human nature of Christ, were led into this mistake, '*that they abstained from the Eucharist, which is the flesh of the Lord Jesus Christ.*' Mr. Tottenham, or his friend, Mr. Lyons, said that it still remained to be ascertained in what sense Ignatius termed the Eucharist '*the flesh of the Lord Jesus Christ.*' Can any one be at a loss to understand these terms? St. Ignatius says that the Eucharist is the *flesh* of Christ; and, as if to meet such doubts as Mr. Tottenham avows, he adds, '*that flesh which suffered for us, and which was raised again from the dead.*' Can there remain any doubt that St. Ignatius, this *immediate successor* of the Apostles, held the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which Mr. Tottenham can trace no higher than the days of the Eutychians?

Passing over many other testimonies of the Fathers, which, if time permitted, I could demonstrate that the origin of Transubstantiation is vainly fixed at the time of the Eutychian heresy, I solicit Protestant attention to the ancient liturgies, which describe the doctrine and forms of the solemn religious practices of the early Christians. Go to these liturgies, and what do you find there? Do you find the doctrine which Mr. Tottenham propounded? *Do they* profess, or even insinuate, that communicants received only bread and wine at the Eucharist, accompanied by a sort of undefined presence of Christ? Do you find any such a doctrine in the ancient liturgies?—in the liturgy of St. Basil?—in the liturgy of St. Chrysostom?—in the liturgy of St. James the Apostle? Though I have no time left to make extracts from these most venerable records of primitive doctrines and usages, an edition of them lies before me, which is not questioned by the most learned Protestants; and these liturgies detail

doctrines and practices, such as you will not find in the law-established Church of this country—but, yet, such as are found in every part of the Catholic Church throughout the world. You will find there solemn prayers preparatory to some great occasion; that great occasion is described. Bread and wine are taken to their altars; the Priest is there with the people in common devotion; at that which they call the time of Consecration, he invokes the divine blessing; he fulfils a command, according to these liturgies, and renews a rite which Christ instituted at the last Supper; the bread he declares to become *the body of Christ*, and the wine *the blood of Christ*. Prayers, too, are used, to which I invite the attention of those amongst our Protestant friends, whose station in society, and whose education enable them to procure and read the ancient Liturgies in the original languages. They will find that the Catholic doctrines of Transubstantiation and of a true proper Sacrifice in the new law, are not innovations of to-day, or yesterday; but that they reach far back into antiquity, and link us with the Apostles, and through them with Christ. Remember, my friends, that we have shown these doctrines to have been entertained and believed—those practices to have been cherished by men whose virtue and whose learning none present will call in question; by St. Cyril, St. Ambrose, St. Gaudentius, and others, who must be respected in the annals of the Christian religion. Remember, that the Catholic doctrine and practice of this day, respecting Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass, are the very doctrines which those luminaries of our religion cherished and defended. Is it for Mr. Tottenham to shake an attachment to these doctrines and practices? Does he think that the new and flickering light which may be offered to us by the Reformation Society, will drive us from our ancient Church? or, that we can shut our eyes to these witnesses of the primitive times who are arrayed before us? Finally, can Mr. Tottenham desire to bring us over to his doctrines, which we judge to be a flat denial of the words of Jesus Christ in the Holy Scriptures?

I can only, now, in the most summary manner, recapitulate the scriptural arguments used in proving to the world that our doctrine and practice are founded on the word of

God. The sixth chapter of St. John records the promise which our Saviour made, that he would give to his followers something more precious than the manna which the forefathers of the Jews had eaten in the desert;—that he would give them bread that came from heaven;—that he is that bread;—that he will give them ‘*his flesh*’ to eat, and ‘*his blood*’ to drink. Many around him refused to believe in his power to redeem this promise,—precisely as, it seems to us, our friends on the opposite side, and all that are attached to their religious system, do at this day. Our Saviour then reminded the incredulous Jews of the consequence of unbelief:—“*he that believeth in me hath everlasting life,*” the converse of which is, that they who refuse to believe in him, have no solid hope, and have not ‘*everlasting life.*’ In this chapter of St. John, is declared, *six different times*, the doctrine that there is provided for us, as food for our souls, the real flesh and the real blood of Jesus Christ, received, *not indeed in the carnal manner in which the Jews understood him*; yet received in reality, and not in figure only, as our friends on the opposite side declare. Go from this promise in the 6th of St. John, to the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, and you find our divine Redeemer, at the Last Supper, fulfilling the promise which he had previously made. He took bread and declared that it was *his body*: he took the cup and declared it to contain *his blood*: he gave a command to his Apostles to do that which he had just done.

I must, for the last time, call your attention to the 1st Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, chap. xi. St. Paul here affirms, that he had learned, by revelation, this same doctrine; and he charges with a great crime those who receive this spiritual food unworthily, telling them, that they ‘*receive damnation, not discerning the Lord’s body.*’ If the body of Christ was not there, where was the ground of St. Paul’s charge that they did not discern it? But, it being really there, as the Apostle had learned by revelation, he most properly and consistently reproveth them for eating it like common food.

We next proceeded to prove to you, the divine institution of the Sacrifice of the Mass. The Prophet Malachi foretold, distinctly, that the Jewish sacrifices, as they no longer pleased the Almighty, should, at the appointed time, cease; and they have ceased:—that they should be succeeded by “*a pure oblation offered from the rising of the*

*sun to the going down of the same:*—accordingly “*among the Gentiles,*” and *in every place,* there is offered this pure oblation, in the Sacrifice of the Mass, which takes place on the altars of the Catholic Church. Christ commanded his Apostles to do that which he had done; he gave them his body and blood to eat and drink, assuring them, that through his body and blood there was remission of sins. This we have proved to have been the uninterrupted practice of the early Christians, and of the greater number of Christian Believers, from the time of the Apostles and their immediate successors, until this day.

---

THE REV. E. TOTTENHAM.

I RISE now, Sir, to conclude this very important discussion. Mr. Edgeworth commenced his closing speech by saying that he would follow my arguments *but briefly*, and not pretend to touch on any except those which I seemed to consider of most importance. This, I acknowledge, was something better than the way in which he acted yesterday, when, as I then told you, he did not follow my arguments *at all*. In my reply I shall notice *first* the remarks which the Rev. Gentleman made previous to his summing up, and *then* endeavour in conclusion, as he has set the example, to *give an outline of the arguments* that have been used on *this* side of the question.

Mr. Edgeworth referred to one of the heavy charges which I brought against the Church of Rome, namely, that of *taking the cup from the people*, and he seemed unwilling to waste the precious moments which were allotted to him, in entering upon this subject, but contented himself with a reference to a pamphlet published by Mr. Brown, in which the Roman Catholic arguments on this point may be found. Now, my impression is, that though Mr. Edgeworth may think this subject “not exactly a part of the matter chosen for our present discussion,” there is yet *so close an alliance* as to warrant our introduction of

it. Looking upon the depriving the laity of the cup as a *consequence made to flow from the doctrine of Transubstantiation*, the Rev. Gentleman must excuse my maintaining that his remark was quite unfounded, when he said that this subject was "*irregularly introduced*" by me. However, as this is the *last* speech I have to make, and as our opponents have no opportunity of reply, I shall not enter more largely on this topic, but leave it to the consideration of those whom I address. They can examine the matter for themselves, and judge whether *the reasons* I was quoting from the Catechism of the Council of Trent when my time expired on the last occasion, or any other reasons, can out-weigh *the strict and positive command of Christ* that we should receive *the wine* as well as the bread. This will appear particularly striking, when they bear in mind that to which I also adverted in my previous address to-day, namely, that the Church of Rome *has confessed* in the Council of Constance *that the administration was originally in both kinds*, and that Dr. Delahogue in his Theology, which is one of the Class-books at Maynooth, acknowledges the practice of communion in *both* kinds to have existed till the period of *the twelfth century*.

I have here to correct a mis-statement, to which I am sorry to say Mr. Edgeworth has *constantly* given utterance, relative to our principles and professions. He declares himself perfectly satisfied with the testimony of Scripture that has been adduced, and he repeats a statement which he had already made more than once, namely, that we, by rejecting his exposition, *deny the truth of the words of Christ*. Sir, need I repeat that this charge is grossly unfounded. We admit the truth of the words of Christ, wherever they may be found, with at least as much readiness as our friends on the opposite side; but I beg them to remember what I have already stated, that, while we do not deny the truth of the words of Christ, we very strongly dispute the correctness of *the interpretation they have put upon them*. This, be it observed, is the point at issue, and not, whether the words of Christ, in themselves, are true or not.

The Rev. Gentleman has alluded to the Roman Catholic divines whom I quoted yesterday on the subject of Transubstantiation, and he imagines I was anxious that the conclusion should be drawn by my hearers, that they differed from the Roman Catholic Church as regards the *doctrine in question*. This "*unjust inference*" he defies



me to sustain. Now really, Sir, Mr. Edgeworth has talked about just nothing here, for, if he took the trouble of exercising his *memory*, he would have recollected that, so far from desiring such an inference to be drawn, I distinctly guarded against it, and stated the very contrary to that which he would attribute to me. So far from labouring to prove that those Roman Catholic Divines did not hold Transubstantiation, the sum of my statement was, that they could not find it clearly in *Scripture*, (which was enough for me,) and therefore took refuge for it in the authority of *the church*. This will appear evident if you remember my quotations, *to which I refer you*. Judge you whether our statements have been represented fairly on this point, or not.

We have had Theodoret introduced again, but as I think his testimony has been adverted to sufficiently often on both sides, I shall, without further observations, leave the public to decide upon this matter from the printed report.

My Rev. opponent next recalled our attention to the use of the words *in the present tense* in the Institution of the Eucharist, and how does he follow up what Mr. Brown had said on this point? He represents me as saying that “*because the present tense is sometimes used for the future, you must allow me to interpret in the future tense in the instance before us.*” This was not, however, the force of my statement. What I wanted to prove by the statement was this, (as will appear by a reference to my argument,) that, inasmuch as the present tense is *constantly used* in *Scripture when the future is intended*, our opponents *had no positive authority* for taking advantage of the use of the present tense in the words of the Institution, as proving that a Sacrifice was actually offered *at the time*.

But, Sir, we have had a long lecture about the impiety of *prescribing to Christ*, and happy should I be if the substance of that lecture had been observed *on the part of our opponents*. I leave it to the meeting to judge, *who*, during the course of this discussion, has prescribed most as to the manner in which God should act. *I appeal fearlessly to my speeches for a refutation of Mr. Edgeworth's charge*. From the very commencement of the discussion I have been *objecting* to such a method of procedure; and have been pointing out *how our antagonists have frequently adopted it*. But the Rev. Gentleman specifies a particular instance, in which he says I have been guilty of a similar



error. I had stated, in a former speech, that if Christ instituted a Sacrifice at the last Supper, it must have been typical, not propitiatory, properly speaking. The connection in which this statement stood I need not repeat, but the statement itself has been made by Mr. E., the basis of his charge that I prescribed to Christ. Most persons, however, will, I think, be able to see that when I used the expression "*it must have been typical, and not strictly propitiatory,*" there was *no prescribing* to Christ what ought to have been done, but *the mere statement of a Scriptural fact*, that every Sacrifice previous to that on the Cross was typical, and not, in a strict and proper sense, propitiatory.

Mr. Edgeworth dwelt a considerable time upon an expression which *he said* was used by Mr. Lyons and myself, viz., that Christ *could not* do so and so. Now, Sir, I protest at the close of this discussion against the imputation of certain principles to us *which we disclaim*. We do *not* question Christ's power; we glory in the fact that Christ is not merely man, but God; and therefore we question *his* power no more than we should question the power of the ever blessed and eternal God. It is needless for me to waste time in refuting Mr. Edgeworth's charge, though twice or thrice repeated by him. Those who have given us their attention know that we argued all along simply on what Christ *had done*, and that we have been constantly *endeavouring to bring our opponents to argue in a similar manner*.

In reference to the term "Sacrificing Priest," (if I must come to this subject again), you will bear in mind that *there has not been an attempt to prove* the authority of such an officer under the New Testament dispensation. This is an important point in the controversy. Mr. Brown has told us that there were certain "*prudential reasons*" against the use of the title in the New Testament, and Mr. Edgeworth has said that it "*has ever distinguished the ministers of Christ since the days of our Lord and his Apostles*"—but THE FACT IS POSITIVE all the time, that *there have not been any Scriptural texts adduced to prove the lawfulness of the office* (except as belonging to Christ personally) under the New Testament economy. It strikes my mind as very remarkable that, *if* the title or office of "Sacrificing Priest" has been received and acknowledged, as Mr. Edgeworth says, since the days of our Lord and his

Apostles, *no text of the New Testament can be adduced in support of it.*

Mr. Edgeworth has again adverted to, and given us, according to his views, a sketch of the ancient discipline of the Secret, which was introduced by Mr. Brown. He complains that I seemed to have my mind perfectly closed against the arguments adduced from this source by his Rev. friend, and this conclusion he draws, I suppose, from the fact, that I have not latterly referred to the subject. My reason, however, was this; first of all, I had referred to the discipline, as I thought, *sufficiently* yesterday; and secondly, it is in my judgment quite a minor point in the controversy. I take, as I said before, the testimony of the “oracles of God” above the discipline of secresy in the early church, or any other discipline. I wish to stand by what that word says, notwithstanding all the arguments that may be urged against us; for, be it remembered, that it is actually throwing dust into the people’s eyes to refer them to the huge folios of the Fathers. How is a poor man ever to discover what he is to believe? Our opponents will tell him that Cyril, Theodoret, and Augustine said so and so, and I can tell him that they and others said quite another thing. It may be well for *learned men* to investigate this subject, *who have the means of coming at the real truth by a diligent examination of the evidence in question*; but how is a *poor unlettered man* to decide, if he is to be guided by testimony similar to this—if such is to be the rule by which he is to form his belief? We have the Bible, blessed be God! in our own language at the present day, and the prophet says—

“To the LAW rather, and to THE TESTIMONY; and if they speak not according to this word, they shall not have the morning light.”—Isa. viii. 20.

Be not bound then by the testimony of men, however valuable it may be in its place. They were at the best *fallible*, and most of you can never authenticate the evidence adduced from them, because most people are not in a capacity or situation to refer to those huge and immense folios; but you all can refer to THE BIBLE, and *judge you this day on which side the powerful testimony of the word of God has been found in this matter.*

The Rev. Gentleman asks me to tell *when the discipline of the Secret began.* I am unable to connect *this* with the question of the *truth* or *falsehood* of Transubstantiation, or

the Sacrifice of the Mass. Did I think it a matter of material consequence at present, I might show that, while Mr. E.'s attempt to prove it *from the Scriptures* is indeed *futile*, its origin may perhaps be traced to the second century; but, at all events, as the question was not started on our side, but on that of our opponents, as tending, in their estimation, to corroborate their doctrine, the onus rested with *them* to prove when it began, not with *us*.

The question of the alleged *idolatry* connected with the Mass, has been introduced once more, and Mr. Edgeworth has, like Mr. Brown, endeavoured to retort the subject of uncertainty on me. On this, however, I feel it quite unnecessary to dwell more, notwithstanding the wish of my opponent that I should give a portion of my time to it. I have, already, I conceive, spoken sufficiently on the subject, and corroborated my statement by a reference to the history of Israel, in the case of the golden calf; and, whatever else *might* be said, I am now content to let my previous statements go before the public, in connection with the distinctions drawn by the Rev. Gentleman on the other side.

Mr. Edgeworth, in treating again of the Fathers and ancient Liturgies, has come to an old practice, yet one which I do not regard as very strong in an argument upon any doctrine. He asks me to tell him, if the sacrifice of the Mass did not exist in the Apostles' days, *when it began to be celebrated*. Why, Sir, if I were not able to tell Mr. Edgeworth when the sacrifice of the Mass was first instituted, or Transubstantiation first introduced, (I do not enter beyond what I have already stated, into the question whether I *could*, or *could not*, point out the exact era of their commencement,) but what I say is, *If I were unable* to give the *precise date* of their first institution, I cannot at all see what that has to do with the question of their *truth* or *falsehood*. I contend that my inability to point out the exact beginning of any doctrine (supposing such inability to exist,) would not prove that doctrine necessarily to be *true*? You recollect the details of one of the parables uttered by our Lord, which teaches us that it was *when men slept* that the tares were sown. We might, therefore, as legitimately argue that the tares *were not sown*, because the precise time at which that took place could not be told, as for Mr. Edgeworth to argue that Transubstantiation, and the sacrifice of the Mass, must be true, if we were unable to point out the precise era at which they were first started.

But in reference to my statement, that I could trace the doctrine of Transubstantiation, even in its rudest shape, no higher than the period of the beginning of the Eutychian heresy *in the fifth century*, he asks me, have I forgotten Ignatius, and others, who flourished before the fifth century? No, Sir, I have not forgotten Ignatius, nor the others. I thought that I had disposed of their testimony already. Mr. Edgeworth quoted from Ignatius, and Justin Martyr, but I asserted at the time that neither Ignatius nor Justin Martyr went a step farther than I could go. They simply *call* the elements “*flesh and blood*,” and declare the bread to be no longer *common bread*, and the wine to be no longer *common wine*. Would not a Protestant willingly use such language? As I said in my last speech yesterday, we use these terms in the Communion Service of the Church of England. Therefore these testimonies of Ignatius and others, do not bear on the *real* point in dispute; they assert nothing more than the Church of England asserts at this day; and, in both cases, though the *terms* “flesh and blood” are used, the language, we contend, involves nothing beyond *the real spiritual presence* of Christ in the Eucharist.

Before I proceed to give an outline of the arguments *we* have employed, I must notice one assertion made by Mr. Edgeworth, in his summary of the Roman Catholic arguments. When speaking of the 11th chapter of 1st Corinthians, he ventured to affirm *that no answer had been given* to the text in that chapter where the Apostle speaks of their ‘*not discerning the Lord’s body*.’ He asks, how St. Paul could speak of discerning it, if it were not there? I beg to remind Mr. Edgeworth that his argument deduced from this passage *was answered*,—I do not say to his satisfaction,—but *an answer was given* by Mr. Lyons, *in his speech the day before yesterday*. However, I will just say a word again upon the passage, as he did not seem to be satisfied. In the first place, it strikes me that the Apostle does not mean to call upon communicants to discern, in a *literal* sense, the body of the Lord; but the expression ‘*not discerning*,’ (μη διακρίνων) means ‘*not making a difference*,’ as to the body of the Lord. I shall prove this by a parallel passage where the same term is used. In the 15th chap. Acts, verses 8, 9, St. Peter thus speaks in the council at Jerusalem:—

“God, who knoweth the hearts, gave testimony, giving unto them (the Gentiles) the Holy Ghost as well as to us (the Jews). And *put no difference* (οὐδὲν διακρίνεις) between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith.”

Here is *one* instance out of *several* in which *the same expression* occurs in the original ; and I maintain that this is the meaning of the text in Corinthians—"not discerning the Lord's body"—NOT MAKING A DIFFERENCE between *ordinary bread* and *that which had been consecrated as the figure of Christ's body* ; not looking upon the elements as changed in *their use*, though *not* in their *nature*. And this was *the very fault* into which the Corinthians *had fallen*, because, as we learn from the context, they had abused the Lord's Supper, and had not regarded the bread and wine as being applied *to sacred purposes*, and being no longer *common bread* and *common wine*. Moreover, I may remind you also of that on which Mr. Lyons insisted—how does a *Roman Catholic* discern the body of the Lord in the Eucharist? It will be confessed that he cannot discern it *literally* : and if he cannot, the passage proves nothing for him. It is only *by faith* he can discern it, and we, in like manner, discern by faith the spiritual presence of our Lord and Saviour with "the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

Want of time, Sir, now prevents my entering further into the subject before us. In drawing, therefore, to a close, I would endeavour, so far as I have opportunity, to offer a few remarks *by way of summing up*.

THE TWO SUBJECTS which have been discussed during the last three days have been, the *Bodily Presence of Christ* in the Eucharist, and *the Sacrifice of the Mass*.

In support of the *former*, the sixth chapter of St. John was adduced on the other side, where our Lord said, "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you;" and other texts of similar import in that chapter were dwelt on. To this we replied, as you will remember that the onus rested on our opponents before they could make use of that chapter, to prove *that there was a reference at all in it to the Sacrament*; and I noticed the opinions of certain *Roman Catholic divines*, who, upon the authority of Cardinal Bellarmine, *admitted that there was no such reference*. It was then shewn you that our Lord must have spoken figuratively or spiritually, and not literally, because if he had enjoined the *literal* partaking of his body and blood, he would have been enjoining a practice *contrary to a precept of the Mosaic law*; whereas we know, according to the testimony of Scripture, that he came "not to destroy the law,

but *to fulfil it.*" It was shown further that, if Roman Catholics take this passage in a strictly literal sense, "*Except you eat, &c. and drink his blood, &c.,*" upon their own principles, *the laity would be lost*, because the laity do not, strictly speaking, *drink the blood*, however they may receive the flesh. The *real* meaning was pointed out from the 35th verse of the chapter, and that meaning appeared to be that by the terms "eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ," the act of *believing upon Christ* was denoted. We saw that constantly such figures are used to express faith; and, in this connection, I noticed how Christ employed the terms "coming, looking, eating, drinking," &c. not to denote the *literal act*, but the *believing* upon him; and it appeared that Christ gave the key to the whole in the 64th verse, when he said, "*The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life.*"

The words of the Institution were then brought forward—"This is my body, this is my blood." Our opponents insisted that they should be taken *literally*—we insisted that they should be taken *figuratively*. The reasons why we urged this figurative interpretation were these:—1st. That the figurative interpretation was *according to the general analogy of Scripture language*. We referred to such passages as—"That rock was Christ;" "This hair is Jerusalem;" and a variety of others of a parallel kind, which shewed that this figurative mode of expression was *quite common* among the Jews at that time, and, therefore, that the Apostles were *quite prepared* to understand the words of the Institution in a *figurative* sense. Then, 2ndly, it was shewn that this figurative mode of expression was *in accordance with the general mode of speaking in all languages*: for, as was remarked, it is quite common for us, in speaking of pictures or maps, to say, "This is such a person;" or "This—speaking of a map—is such a country;" though we only mean by the term "is" that it "*represents.*" Furthermore, 3rdly, we pointed out that the figurative interpretation was *according to the context*, because, as our friends on the other side confessed, "*This cup is the New Testament in my blood,*" was to be understood *figuratively*. I observed that if *they* interpreted one part figuratively, *I* was justified in interpreting the other figuratively; and that the *inconsistency* rested with *them*, as interpreting *one part literally and the other figuratively*.

Moreover, the passage in the 1st Epistle to the Corin-



thians was referred to, about "discerning the Lord's body." To this I have just replied, and therefore it is not necessary to advert to it again.

Then the Fathers were adduced in support of Transubstantiation. I observed that they spoke strongly with regard to the Eucharist, but it was, I contended, of a *moral* change rather than a *physical* they spoke, however highly wrought their language may sometimes have been. *Other* remarks were made respecting the Fathers at various periods of the discussion which will be seen more particularly in the Report.

AGAINST Transubstantiation it was urged that the elements were called *bread* and *wine* both by our Lord and the Apostle Paul *even after consecration*. It was shown you likewise, that our Lord was *absent from earth as to his body* "till the times of the restitution of all things." This was proved by a passage in the Acts, and hence it was concluded that, however he might be present as to his deity, he was not present in a *bodily* sense in the Eucharist. *Other* arguments from *Scripture*, were urged, *upon which I have not time to dwell*.

It was also argued that the doctrine of Transubstantiation *contradicted the senses*—that when we exercised any or all of those senses upon the elements, *after consecration*, they gave their unanimous assent to the fact that there had been *no substantial change*. Remember, too, that this species of reasoning was not a departure from our principles (as was asserted on the other side); for though we adduced arguments from *the senses*, yet *we based them upon texts of the sacred volume*; and we shewed you that the evidence of *Christ's resurrection*, according to the testimony of the Apostles, was found in the fact that he was *seen* by various individuals and collective bodies, who *ate*, and *drank*, and *conversed with him* after he rose from the dead. Hence we had *scriptural authority* for the argument from the senses, and Mr. Brown, although he *rejected* this argument in *our* case, yet *made use of the evidence of the senses himself in one point*. We say, therefore, that we have the testimony both of the *senses* and of *Scripture*, that *no substantial change takes place* in the bread and wine, but that the *bread remains bread*, and the *wine remains wine*. They may be changed in their *use*, but they are *not* changed in their *nature*.

We proceeded to consider, in the *second* place, "The



- **SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.** On the Roman Catholic side the prophecy of Malachi was urged, in which God declares,—

“ From the rising of the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles ; and in every place there is *sacrifice*, and there is offered to my name a *clean oblation*.”

It was shewn, however, that *neither of the terms* used here *necessarily imply anything like literal sacrifice*, much less the Sacrifice of *the Mass*. Not the term “ *sacrifice*,” because it is applied in Scripture to a variety of *other things besides literal sacrifice*—such as *prayer*, and *praise*, and *the bodies of believers*—and, therefore, if the system of interpretation adopted on the other side were correct, namely, that, *because the term is used*, it must mean the Sacrifice of the Mass, I might prove, on the same principle, that *prayer* was the Sacrifice of the Mass, or *praise*, or any of the other things to which also the term is applied. Nor could the term “ *clean oblation*” (it was pointed out in continuation) refer to anything like the Sacrifice of the Mass, till our opponents could prove that the word was *confined in Scripture to a sacrificial meaning*. That it was *not* so confined was shown by a reference to a passage in the 66th chapter of Isaiah, where *the same word* was applied to *persons*, and translated “ *gift*” or “ *offering*.” In this manner we endeavoured to establish that the prophecy naturally referred to the various *spiritual sacrifices* that were to be offered to God “ from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same.”

Our opponents adduced also, in support of the Mass, the language of the institution, “ My blood which is shed.” Respecting this we pointed out that there could be no valid argument derived from the use of the *present tense*, because, in the Bible, that tense was *constantly employed when the future was intended*; and the *inconsistency of our adversaries* was exhibited in the fact that they argued from the use of the present tense in the Greek text and in the Protestant translation, while the *Vulgate* (their standard Latin version), the *Canon of the Mass*, and the *Roman Catholic English version* of the Scriptures, read the passage in the *future tense*.

The passage in the 13th chapter of Acts, ver. 1, 2, which speaks of certain disciples “ *ministering to the Lord*,” was likewise brought forward; and the Rev. Gentlemen at-

tempted to deduce the Sacrifice of the Mass from this expression. But I showed, in the course of my investigation of Mr. Brown's statements respecting this passage, that, by the same rule of interpretation, I might prove *magistrates* and others, yea, even *angels*, to be sacrificing priests also.

AGAINST the sacrifice of the Mass there were a variety of objections urged. There was a parallel drawn by my friend, Mr. Lyons, between the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as originally instituted, and the Sacrifice of the Mass; and you have seen in what points they differed from each other. It was shown, also, that the *essentials* of a proper sacrifice were wanting in the Sacrifice of the Mass, and, therefore, that it could not be "true, proper, and propitiatory." There was *no destruction of a victim in it*; and, moreover, you have seen that *there has been no attempt to prove from Scripture* the existence of the office of *sacrificing priest* under this dispensation, except as respects Christ himself. Therefore, if the destruction of the victim and a sacrificing priest be *wanting*, there can be no proper sacrifice in the Mass, and consequently the Creed of Pope Pius IV. is false, when it calls the Mass "a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice." We adduced, also, a *negative* argument, the substance of which was this:—that in those places of Scripture where we might most naturally expect to find such a sacrifice mentioned, if it were revealed, viz. in the commission to the Apostles, the conduct of the early Christians recorded in the Acts, and the letters to Timothy and Titus, there is *not the slightest allusion to any such thing*. Moreover, a variety of passages from the Epistle to the Hebrews were dwelt on; and you will remember how constantly the Apostle Paul made use of the term "*once*," repeating it again and again, as if to guard against the most distant approach to that which might derogate from the honour and sufficiency of Christ's one offering. Furthermore, other passages established that "*without shedding of blood* there is no remission," and the Sacrifice of the Mass, being confessedly an *unbloody* sacrifice, could not therefore, obtain remission, that is, be *propitiatory*. You have seen, also, how the early part of the 10th chap. of Hebrews demonstrated *that the repetition or continuation of a sacrifice proved its imperfection*; and how, on this principle, the Sacrifice of the Mass, professing to be a continuation, if not a repetition, of that on the cross, *practically asserted the insufficiency* of the sacrifice of *the Cross*,

and also *its own* insufficiency. You heard, likewise, the argument from the 9th chapter of Hebrews—that Christ could not be offered *without suffering*, and that, as he does not *suffer* in the Mass, he cannot *be offered* in the Mass, and therefore the Mass is *not* a “true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice.”

Were I to give you an outline of *every* portion of the arguments employed on this subject, I should go on in this manner for a length of time, but the period which is allotted me for addressing you is rapidly expiring, and *I must therefore forego any further summary*. I can only earnestly request you to bear in mind what has been said, particularly the different passages of Holy Writ that have been adduced, which set before us the truth that Christ “*by one oblation hath perfected for ever* them that are sanctified.” This text is a declaration which, in itself, is sufficiently strong on which to take our stand, and *it has not been noticed on the other side*. It not merely asserts the value of Christ’s offering in general terms, but it tells you particularly, that, by that “*one offering he hath perfected for ever* them that are sanctified;” as the Apostle says in another passage, which I quoted yesterday, “Christ entered *once* into the Holies (i. e. into Heaven) having obtained *eternal redemption*.” I asked the question before, and I ask it now again, *What can a man want beyond* ETERNAL REDEMPTION? and that inestimable blessing—that glorious result—is said to be obtained by the *one* finished work of Immanuel, when he entered into Heaven, “the holiest of all,” and presented himself before his Father as the victorious surety of sinners.

In conclusion, then, I say, first of all—(and I do it in the exercise of that charity and faithfulness, which I have endeavoured to exhibit all through this Discussion, and which I would desire to manifest to the very close)—that, if these be the testimonies of the Bible respecting the great salvation of the Lord Jesus, it becomes us, who profess to be the Ministers of the Gospel—the heralds of salvation—to bethink ourselves on this momentous point—to “make full proof of our ministry”—to bear in mind the “woe” denounced against those who “preach not the gospel”—to examine our hearts diligently and faithfully, lest in any manner we should give even a *practical* denial to the complete redemption effected by CHRIST.

And to you, my hearers in general, I say, remember the

fearful consideration that my friend, Mr. Lyons, sought to impress upon you at the close of his last address. He told you, that the hearing of the truth made you either better or worse, and so it is. The Gospel never left any man as it found him; it either proved, as the Apostle says, "the savour of life unto life, or of death unto death," to his soul. The declaration of truth increases a man's *privilege*, and therefore places him under a far weightier *responsibility* than if such privilege was not his. Bear in mind, then, your present situation. You have had opportunity, during this week and the past, of coming to this place to hear those gentlemen on the one side, and my friend and myself on the other. We have put forth arguments on each side: we have endeavoured to substantiate our respective beliefs. Recollect, therefore, that of *this*, as of every other opportunity of discovering "the truth as it is in Jesus," you will have to give an account when you come to stand before the tribunal of the Most High. Some of you may imagine, perhaps, that it is pleasant to observe the conflict of argument, while you may not think of your own deep interest in the questions discussed; but I remind you that, not only should your *intellects* be exercised in the investigation of truth, but *your hearts affected* by its immense importance. Do not think we are disputing for *victory*—it is for *truth* we contend. Do not think we have been speaking about non-essential things, about matters of minor consequence—it has been said on the other side, and I repeat it now, that we have been talking about things *that concern the salvation of the soul*. Oh! then, exhibit that wisdom which becomes intelligent and immortal beings—show yourselves anxious about your best, your truest, your eternal interests—and seek the Lord, encouraged by the promise that those who seek "*shall find him, when they search for him with all their hearts*." Let there be no delay—no hesitation—no Felix-like postponement to "a more convenient season," that may never come. Remember the melancholy case that has occurred among yourselves, and take warning from this to flee before it be too late, to the refuge set before you in the Gospel—to look by faith to that ALMIGHTY SAVIOUR, who "TAKETH AWAY THE SINS OF THE WORLD," and who is "THE END OF THE LAW FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS TO EVERY ONE THAT BELIEVETH."

## THE CHAIRMAN.

THE concluding words of the eloquent advocate, whom you have just heard, dissolves this meeting, and with the dissolution of the meeting my office is at an end.

As the individual who has occupied this Chair, a duty yet remains to be performed which I would not omit; but I will endeavour to trespass no longer on your attention than is absolutely necessary for its discharge.

In the first place, I would offer a humble tribute of admiration to the Gentlemen on either side of me, to whom we have listened with such unabated interest. I doubt not but that to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, as to myself, it has been a matter of astonishment, that, in such a sharp and lengthened collision of rugged thoughts and hard arguments, the combatants should have elicited the truth without wounding each other. If, in this arduous conflict, wounds have been received, I trust that, as professing Ministers of a meek and lowly Saviour, a balm will be sought for and applied whereby they can be healed.

Having thus ventured to offer a few words of commendation to the Rev. advocates generally, I would now beg to pay an acknowledgment to the Rev. Gentlemen on my left, in particular. I feel much pleasure in expressing to them, both for my friends and for myself, our sense of the courtesy, I may say kindness, with which they have treated us since the moment that we crossed the threshold of this College. They will allow me to say, that, although the religious differences which separate us be great, and they may never pass away, yet that there is one thing which will remain, and the memory of which we shall cherish — and that is the recollection of their courtesy.

And now, Ladies and Gentlemen, permit me address a parting word to yourselves, a word, too, of merited commendation. The talents and the moderation of the Rev. and learned champions must have been exercised in vain — it would have been utterly in vain for them to have elicited the truth, if you had not extended to them a most patient and most attentive hearing. Not only, then, as Chairman of this meeting, have I to thank you in behalf of the cause itself, for which we have been assem-

bled, for the manner in which you have performed your part in the task, and (considering how powerfully the feelings have been excited, and how painful it must have been so entirely to restrain them) the task was no easy one, I have to thank you for myself. I came to this Chair with no small degree of apprehension, lest I should compromise its dignity by some failure in the performance of its duties. But the harmony, the propriety of demeanour, and the peace, which have not been once interrupted during the whole period, have rendered my office a mere sinecure. Your conduct has covered all my deficiencies. In truth, I have been a mere regulator of time and, as it were, a *pendulum* vibrating between the conflicting parties on the right and left,—and the only duty devolving on me seemed to be the care of regulating the vibrations with strict impartiality. Possibly it may be expected, that I should now advert to the Discussion itself, and attempt to lay before you a summary of the arguments. But this, assuredly, is no part of my office. I depose the balance before you—examine the scales yourselves—it is for you and for the Public, and not for me, to determine which scale preponderates. Were my private opinions of a ton or a talent weight, or lighter even than a feather, I should deem myself unworthy of the place I have occupied, were I to cast that feather into the scale. With these few words I take my leave. Ladies and Gentlemen, I thank you for your indulgence, and I humbly bid you farewell.

THE REV. E. TOTTENHAM:—Before any other step be taken, I beg to say, I rise with the greatest possible pleasure, on the part of the Reformation Society, to thank the Rev. Gentlemen on the other side, and the members of the College generally, for the use of this Chapel, and also for the extreme kindness and accommodation which have been afforded us during the whole Discussion.

On the motion of the Rev. F. EDGEWORTH, seconded by the Rev. T. J. BROWN, E. T. CAULFEILD, Esq. vacated the Chair, which was then occupied by DANIEL FRENCH, Esq.

Mr. EDGEWORTH said—I have great pleasure in expressing my own individual gratitude to the gentleman who has just left the Chair. I am sure the feeling, which from the first moment of the discussion to the present instant, I have cherished, has been fully participated in by every Lady and Gentleman, in reference to his conduct,



and uninterrupted attention to the important matters which have necessarily occupied a great portion of our time. His conduct has been unquestionably impartial ; and the final act which you have just witnessed, stamps what I would wish to say, rather than what I am able to say, upon the conduct he has shewn in performing the office of Chairman during the Discussion. I beg to move, that the thanks of this meeting be presented to EDWIN T. CAULFEILD, Esq. for his kindness and attention, and his undoubted impartiality throughout this Discussion.

SAMUEL DAY, Esq. seconded the motion, which was unanimously adopted by the meeting.

EDWIN T. CAULFEILD, Esq.—I had almost, or, rather, had altogether desired that you had dispensed with, rather than conformed to, the complimentary usage which I am called to acknowledge. I do not feel assured of deserving this compliment, of thanks, although it be but a customary one—nor am I disposed to take to myself the credit which, perhaps, your courtesy might seem to warrant. And yet, in saying this, I should be grieved if you thought that I was unable to appreciate your kindness.—It is really because I am in danger of overrating, instead of not appreciating, your courtesy, in this matter, that I shrink from regarding it as my desert.

Suffer me to offer you a child-like, but not, I hope, a childish illustration of my meaning. Those present who are parents, may have observed, that when a child has received something it values very highly, or that possesses a great and obviously intrinsic worth, the child will run to the parent to entreat that the treasure may be kept till the owner is capable of making a fitting use of it. I do acknowledge myself to be but as a child in Christianity, as regarding praise. Praise when deserved is one of the most precious gifts man can receive.

This is a solemn occasion and a solemn place, and I do not conceive it an unbecoming illustration of this high estimate of praise, when I refer, in confirmation of my opinion, to the solemnities of the last great day.—Praise is the language which the people of the Lord shall hear when entering the kingdom He hath prepared for them.—

“ Well done, thou good and faithful servant.”

To return, then, to your commendation, suffer me to say that I am afraid of it; I dare not receive it.—I beseech you, therefore, take and keep it for me, 'till I am more worthy of it,—and then, perhaps, it may not be abused.—



If I have done any thing to merit praise, I must acknowledge that I ascribe it entirely to Him alone to whom all praise is due ;—were I to take that merit to myself, my conscience tells me that I should defraud the living God.

---

Thus terminated the proceedings. They were conducted throughout with the greatest harmony, and during the six days not a solitary instance occurred of any interruption, arising from the expression of either approbation or disapprobation, or from any other cause.

It had been arranged (see page 441) by the Reverend Disputants to refer the translation of the disputed passage in Theodoret's Dialogues to some Greek scholars mutually selected. In the absence of others, however, it was submitted, after the discussion, to Daniel French, Esq. a Roman Catholic Barrister, who gave it as his opinion that the passage admitted of different translations. It was agreed, therefore, to subjoin the entire passage in the original :—

Ορθοδ. Ἐπεὶ τοίνυν, τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα παρὰ τῶν ἱερωμένων τῷ Θεῷ προσφερόμενα, τίνων ἐστὶ σύμβολα;

Ερανιστ. Τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ σώματος τε καὶ αἵματος.

Ορθοδ. Τοῦ ὄντως σώματος, ἢ οὐκ ὄντως;

Ερανιστ. Τοῦ ὄντως.

Ορθοδ. Ἀριστα· χρὴ γὰρ εἶναι τὸ τῆς εἰκόνης ἀρχέτυπον· καὶ γὰρ οἱ ζωγράφοι τὴν φύσιν μιμοῦνται, καὶ τῶν ὁρωμένων γράφουσι τὰς εἰκόνας.

Ερανιστ. Ἀληθές.

Ορθοδ. Εἰ τοίνυν τοῦ ὄντως σώματος ἀντίτυπα ἐστὶ τὰ θεῖα μύσθηρια, σῶμα ἄρα ἐστὶ καὶ νῦν τοῦ Δεσπότου τὸ σῶμα, οὐκ εἰς θεότητος φύσιν μεταβληθὲν, ἀλλὰ θείας δόξης ἀναπλησθέν.

Ερανιστ. Εἰς καιρὸν τὸν περὶ τῶν θείων μυστηρίων ἐκίνησας λόγον· ἐντεῦθεν σοι γὰρ δείξω τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ σώματος τὴν εἰς ἑτέραν φύσιν μεταβολήν· ἀποκρίναι τοίνον πρὸς τὰς ἐμὰς ἐρωτήσεις.

Ορθοδ. Ἀποκρινοῦμαι.

Ερανιστ. Τί καλεῖς τὸ προσφερόμενον δῶρον πρὸ τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἐπικλήσεως;

Ορθοδ. Οὐ χρὴ σαφῶς εἰπεῖν, εἰκὸς γὰρ τίνας ἀμυήτους παρεῖναι.

Ερανιστ. Αἰνιγματωδῶς ἢ ἀπόκρισις ἔστω.

Ορθοδ. Τὴν ἐκ τοιῶνδε σπερμάτων τροφήν.

Ερανιστ. Τὸ δὲ ἕτερον σύμβολον πῶς ὀνομάζομεν;

Ορθοδ. Κοινὸν καὶ τοῦτο ὄνομα, πόματος εἶδος σημαῖνον.

Ερανιστ. Μετὰ δέ γε τὸν ἁγιασμὸν πῶς ταῦτα προσαγορεύεις;

Ορθοδ. Σῶμα Χριστοῦ, καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ.

Ερανιστ. Καὶ πιστεύεις γε σώματος Χριστοῦ μεταλαμβάνειν, καὶ αἵματος;

Ορθοδ. "Ουτῶ πιστεύω.

Ερανιστ. "Ωσπερ τοίνυν τὰ σύμβολα τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ σώματος τε καὶ αἵματος, ἄλλα μὲν εἰσι πρὸ τῆς ἱερατικῆς επικλήσεως, μετὰ δέ γε τὴν ἐπίκλησιν μεταβάλλεται καὶ ἕτερα γίνεται· οὕτω τὸ δεσποτικὸν σῶμα, μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν, εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν μετεβλήθη τὴν Θεῖαν.

Ορθοδ. 'Εάλως αἷς ὕφηνες ἄρκυσιν· οὐδὲ γὰρ μετὰ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα τῆς οἰκείας ἐξίσταται φύσεως· μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτεράς οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ σχήματος καὶ τοῦ εἶδους, καὶ ὁρατὰ ἐστὶ, καὶ ἅπτα, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν· νοεῖται δὲ ἅπερ ἐγένετο, καὶ πιστεύεται, καὶ προσκυνεῖται, ὡς ἐκεῖνα ὄντα ἅπερ πιστεύεται. Παράθες τοίνυν τῷ αρχετύπῳ τὴν εἰκόνα, καὶ ὅψει τὴν ὁμοιότητα· χρὴ γὰρ εἰκέναι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ τὸν τύπον.


Theodoret. Dial. II. vol. iv. p. 125. edidit. Schulze,  
8vo. Halæ, 1772.

THE END.

中國書局影印







.

